DOCUMENT RESUME

LI 001 026

D 023 429

Proceedings of the Conference on School-Public Library Relations (New York City, February 8-9, 1968).

New York State Education Dept., Albany. Div. of Library Development.

Pub Date 68

Note -84p.

EDRS Price MF -$0.50 HC -$4.30

Descriptors - *Library Cooperation, Library Programs, *Library Services, *Public Libraries, *School Libraries, Student Needs, *Students

The general purpose of this conference was to bring together school and public librarians to discuss library service to the student, "wherever he lives, wherever or whether he attends school, and whatever his aspirations and abilities." Topics discussed at the conference include new developments and goals in service to students, impact of current programs on student services, patterns in promoting cooperative library service, the role of the Commissioner's Committee on Library Development in service to students, and ideas for using an interlibrary cooperative development project fund. The major concerns to come out of the discussions were for adequacy of service, comprehensive program and fiscal planning, an integrated structure, mutual respect and understanding of roles, and user oriented goals. A 3 page summary of the conference proceedings is provided along with a list of the conference participants. (CC)

LI 001026

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE ON SCHOOL–PUBLIC LIBRARY RELATIONS

ERIC/CLIS
NOV 6 '68
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

New York City
February 8–9, 1968

ED023429

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LI 001026

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK/THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
DIVISION OF LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT/ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224/1968

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE CONFERENCE
ON
SCHOOL-PUBLIC LIBRARY RELATIONS

New York City

February 8-9, 1968

The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Division of Library Development
Albany, New York 12224
1968

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of the University (with years when terms expire)

1969 Joseph W. McGovern, A.B., LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D., *Chancellor* - New York
1970 Everett J. Penny, B.C.S., D.C.S., *Vice Chancellor* - - - - - White Plains
1978 Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D. - - - - - - - - - - - Troy
1973 Charles W. Millard, Jr., A.B., LL.D., L.H.D. - - - - - - - - Buffalo
1972 Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S. - - - - - - - Purchase
1975 Edward M. M. Warburg, B.S., L.H.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - New York
1977 Joseph T. King, LL.B. - Queens
1974 Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Brooklyn
1976 Mrs. Helen B. Power, A.B., Litt.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Rochester
1979 Francis W. McGinley, B.S., LL.B., LL.D. - - - - - - - - - - - Glens Falls
1981 George D. Weinstein, LL.B. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Hempstead
1980 Max J. Rubin, LL.B., L.H.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - New York
1971 Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - Hastings on Hudson
1982 Stephen K. Bailey, A.B., B.A., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D. - - - - - Syracuse

President of the University and Commissioner of Education
James E. Allen, Jr.

Deputy Commissioner of Education
Ewald B. Nyquist

Associate Commissioner for Cultural Education
Hugh M. Flick

Assistant Commissioner for Libraries
John A. Humphry

Director, Division of Library Development
Jean L. Connor

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION - Esther Helfand -- v

PROGRAM -- vii

WELCOME - John A. Humphry -- 1

NEW DEVELOPMENTS AND GOALS IN SERVICE TO STUDENTS

Dr. Frances Henne -- 3
Emerson Greenaway -- 9

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION PERIOD -- 13

IMPACT OF CURRENT PROGRAMS ON STUDENT SERVICES

E. J. Josey -- 15
Edwin S. Holmgren -- 23
Martin Brech -- 27

PATTERNS IN PROMOTING COOPERATIVE LIBRARY SERVICE

Andrew Geddes -- 37
John Mackenzie Cory -- 43
Dr. Richard L. Darling -- 49
Dr. Mark B. Scurrah --- 55

REACTION TO DISCUSSION -- 57

THE COMMISSIONER'S COMMITTEE: PERSPECTIVE ON SERVICE TO STUDENTS

Harold S. Hacker -- 59

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION PERIOD -- 63

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FUND:
IDEAS FOR JOINT PLANNING

Helen R. Sattley -- 65
Laurence G. Hill -- 69
Mrs. Dinah Lindauer --- 71

SUMMARY - Jean L. Connor --- 75

REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS --- 79

CORRY RESOLUTION -- 87

INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the first Division of Library Development conference on the subject of school-public library relations. This conference is being jointly sponsored by the Division of Library Development and the Bureau of School Libraries.

It was planned 1 year ago, in response to a need that not only was felt, but clearly expressed by several key people in the State. Because the expression of need - the requests for some kind of meeting of minds - came to me and to Bob Barron, our school-public library liaison, the emphasis is on service to students of secondary school age, as opposed to students of all ages.

During the year much has happened, both in the area of school-public library relations specifically, as well as in peripheral areas of library service affecting school libraries and public libraries. So, the reasons for having scheduled such a conference in February 1967 have changed several times in the past year and the changes are reflected in the makeup of this audience, the program itself and to some extent, we hope, the changing picture of library service, per se.

Those of us involved in the planning have a strong feeling that this is the time for giant steps and, perhaps of necessity, skipping a few steps. It is not enough to talk about school and public library roles, about similarities and differences, about exchanging and sharing and - indeed - about knowing and cooperating. It seems to us that we are somewhere beyond this point in library history.

The major purpose of this conference is to define the direction which we need to take if we are to prepare the way for what library service will be, and must be in the future. To help us do this, we are calling upon some of the keenest minds in the profession, the "idea" people, to think, consider, explore, dream, predict. We are asking all conference participants to become so involved, to zero in on the major concern of this conference - library service to the student, wherever he lives, wherever or whether he attends school, and whatever his aspirations and abilities.

Esther Helfand

CONFERENCE ON SCHOOL/PUBLIC LIBRARY RELATIONS

Sheraton Motor Inn, New York City
February 8-9, 1968

PROGRAM

Thursday, February 8

1:30 P.M. REGISTRATION

2:00 P.M. WELCOME

John A. Humphry
Assistant Commissioner for Libraries

2:15 P.M. NEW DEVELOPMENTS AND GOALS IN SERVICE TO STUDENTS

Dr. Frances Henne, Professor
Columbia University School of Library Service

Implications of Joint Committee on Standards

Emerson Greenaway, Director
Free Library of Philadelphia

Implications of the President's Commission on Library Development

3:00 P.M. GENERAL DISCUSSION

3:30 P.M. IMPACT OF CURRENT PROGRAMS ON STUDENT SERVICES

E. J. Josey, Consultant, Academic & Research Libraries Bureau
Division of Library Development

Edwin Holmgren, President, Association of New York Libraries
for Technical Services (ANYLTS)

Martin Brech, Associate, Bureau of School Libraries
New York State Education Department

4:30 P.M. ADJOURNMENT

(over)

Friday, February 9

9:00 A.M. PATTERNS IN PROMOTING COOPERATIVE LIBRARY SERVICE

PANELISTS:

Andrew Geddes, Director
Nassau Library System

Dr. Richard L. Darling, Director of Instructional Materials
Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland

John Mackenzie Cory, Deputy Director
The New York Public Library

Mark B. Scurrah, Coordinator, Title III ESEA
New York State Education Department

10:30 A.M. COFFEE BREAK

10:45 A.M. GENERAL DISCUSSION

11:15 A.M. THE COMMISSIONER'S COMMITTEE: PERSPECTIVE ON SERVICE TO STUDENTS

Harold S. Hacker, Director, Rochester Public Library and
Monroe County Library System

1:30 P.M. LUNCH

2:00 P.M. INTERLIBRARY COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FUND:
IDEAS FOR JOINT PLANNING

PANELISTS:

Helen R. Sattley, Director, School Library Service
New York City Board of Education

Laurence G. Hill, Director
Westchester Library System

Mrs. Dinah Lindauer, Coordinator of Programs and Services
Nassau Library System

3:30 P.M. SUMMATION

Frank A. Stevens, Chief
Bureau of School Libraries

Jean L. Connor, Director
Division of Library Development

- Presiding Throughout the Conference -

Robert E. Barron
School-Public Library Liaison

Esther Helfand
Young Adult Consultant

Division of Library Development

WELCOME - John A. Humphry, Assistant Commissioner for Libraries

It is indeed a pleasure to open this conference on School/Public Library Relations. It is a subject in which I have a real interest and great conviction. When Jean Connor and Frank Stevens approached me on planning such a get-together, we all felt it was an opportune time to sponsor such a conference. Your presence and enthusiasm today reinforce our decision.

There is nothing startlingly new about the interest in cooperation, about the concern for devising a program of total library service. Throughout library literature we see references to such efforts and projects. But there are more compelling reasons today to justify and motivate us to such action. The recognition that libraries are receiving, the fact that about one-third of our population is comprised of students, the acceptance of libraries in the educational process, Federal and State financial support, the preparation of standards and goals, the responsible attitude of leaders in the profession, and the President's appointment of an Advisory Commission on Libraries and the role in a nationwide communications network lead us into cooperation rather than competition.

It is wise to set up some simple and basic guides to what is meant by cooperative relations between and among libraries and librarians.

First, let us be responsible about our discussions and base observations and recommendations on facts and valid information. My first requisite, being responsibility, requires each of us to speak with conviction based on knowledge of the situations, backgrounds, and peculiarities of the matter. In other words, we need information - basic information - and then we can move forward.

Secondly, we need to proceed intelligently, my second recommended requisite toward meaningful cooperation. We must encourage leadership for each type of library to define its goals, state its functions that clearly identify them from the other types and yet how they coordinate. As we work together on this effort, we come to the third requisite.

We must respect each other's program and learn more about it. Then we can sit down together and discuss ways in which strong units of service can correlate efforts in the interest of efficiency and quality service.

The final suggested guide is that we think of the user and attempt to learn more about him, how he uses a library and then we can organize service programs more effectively.

As we think, talk, and act together, solutions to our common concern, how best can we serve our users, will be forthcoming.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS AND GOALS IN SERVICE TO STUDENTS

Dr. Frances Henne, Professor, Columbia University School of Library Service

I am reporting on the developments of the Joint Committee for the Preparation of Standards for Media Programs in Schools, and therefore, indicating the implications for this particular meeting. Let me describe briefly the membership of this committee for some of you who may not know about its activities. The Joint Committee consists of 12 representatives from the American Association of School Librarians and 12 representatives from the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction of the National Education Association. The Executive and Assistant Executive Secretaries of these two groups also attend and participate in the meetings of the Joint Committee. We have had during the past year several all-day meetings of this particular group. The Joint Committee has the responsibility for preparing standards for school media programs. When they have completed and endorsed a statement of standards, the work will be submitted to the boards of the professional associations involved, and to an Advisory Board that first assigned the preparation of the standards to the Joint Committee.

The Advisory Board consists of representatives from 28 professional and civic organizations. Changes recommended by these associations and by the advisory boards representing these associations will be incorporated in the final draft. Therefore I would like to stress that the work of the Joint Committee and the Advisory Board has not been completed. What I report today carries no official final approval. It is a progress report. We are meeting again for 3 days during this month and at that time I hope we will reach endorsement of one of those first final drafts. I am also talking from a national viewpoint and not from any one state's viewpoint and I am picking from the statements of the standards we have so far discussed and endorsed to this extent. I will in no way, and I wish to underline this, give a summary of the qualitative standards that are in the current draft of the standards for media programs. I am going to use the terminology of the standards and this means that I will be using the following terms, which in a sense are directly related to this meeting, because they do constitute a trend in terminology.

Media center is that place in the school where the full range of materials and the services that accompany them are accessible to students and teachers. It represents a unified program involving both audiovisual and printed resources, with a single administrative organization. The center may have branches or satellites or arms in the school, whether the school has one or more than one building in the school plan. Media program refers to the services and instructional programs in the media center, and may I again stress the point that Mr. Humphry stressed, and that is the standards are designed entirely with the objective of providing a good instructional program for students in the schools in this country. The media specialist indicates a professional staff member working in the media program. The district media center refers to the center as the larger organizational unit which may represent one school system or several school systems. The State media program refers to the services provided at the State level.

As I have brooded about this talk, I have selected several topics which seem to me to relate to the theme of our conference, and in view of the limitations of the time that we have at our disposal, I will gallop through these very quickly.

The major purposes of national standards have a direct relation on the subject of the discussions of today and tomorrow. They are these: to promote the establishment of media centers and programs in schools that now have none. For example, 60 percent of the elementary schools in this country are still without media centers and services, and millions of children are without them in our schools. Quite frequently, of course, this happens in areas where they are also without services in other types of libraries. Another objective of national standards is to assist in the improvement of the quality of media centers and programs now operating in schools. Most schools in this country now have substandard media programs. It should be stated at this point that the national standards are not visionary and are designed for present educational needs, even though it is recognized that many schools will take several years to achieve them. So current are the national standards, which we hope will be ready for June 1968, that the Committee is strongly recommending that the standards be revised at least every two years because of all of the many social, educational, and ethnographic changes.

I think it is relevant also at this time to indicate that we can see one effect of the standards at a national level when we realize that the 1960 standards, which have been mentioned, are now recognized officially as State standards in many States, because the ESEA program motivated and implemented formulation of State standards, and a great many States just went on record as saying the 1960 standards were theirs. In 1960, I am quite certain that most States that have been doing this would not have felt that this was possible, but it is. Already, each day I am getting constant clamoring from the many committees all over the country that are working on new statements of standards for their own States and they wish by air-mail delivery or dog team if it is faster (which it generally is these days), to have our 1968 statements as they are. By promoting and implementing good media programs as represented in these objectives, national standards contribute, along with many other causal factors, to the achievement of desirable standards of service, and also, more important, to solve instructional programs for the youth of this country.

In former discussions of school and public library relations, one recurrent theme has been to the effect that objective evaluation and realistic cooperative planning cannot be achieved while substandard conditions existed in the libraries and until systematic indepth research had been undertaken. It is to be hoped that national standards bring us closer to resolving the first condition; as for the second, they at least provide criteria for measurements and evaluations needed for some aspects of research and investigation.

Now, for some more specifics that relate to our topic - and I am merely going to touch upon these with about one sentence each - I turn now to the work of the Standards Committee in relation to materials, and I will not amplify these points but will merely enumerate them. The national standards as in 1945 and 1960 are again stressing that the media collections in the media center include materials not only for specific assignments, but also for nonacademic purpose needs and interests of students. Also, under materials we are again emphasizing this necessity to provide these in sufficient quantity to meet demand. This means duplication of much needed titles and it also means that with the availability of paperbacks, that it has become increasingly possible to meet these needs. There also is a great stress in this version of the standards, although it was there in 1960, about the need for having an abundance of audiovisual materials of all types in the media center in the school building.

If I were to predict trends, I would say definitely that one trend today is to decentralize audiovisual materials from a district center into the school building - not only 16mm.films but obviously 8mm.films of all kinds, and many of the new computerized instructional aids, as well as the well-known, long-established audiovisual materials in other categories. These materials are to be made easily available for use by individual students and teachers in the media center in the school. They will make it possible in the media center of course, as they have for 20 years and more, so that students and teachers may make the much needed multimedia, multisensory or cross-media approach to and use of materials.

Also we are continuing to emphasize the need for magazines in the media center with sufficient number of titles of magazines and duplicate copies, where needed, and necessary indexes and duplicate copies of indexes, where needed, to meet the needs and interests of students. There is more emphasis here this year on microform, microreaders, and so forth. Again we are placing emphasis on the need for professional materials for teachers, to be made accessible in every school building as part of the media center's program. We are also indicating, as in the past, that these materials should be made accessible to the parents.

In relation to materials I go now to point 3, to stress accessibility. I have already mentioned the need to duplicate titles. We are now seeing the start in some school systems where paperback books are being given to the students for their home libraries. Other aspects of accessibility that touch upon our topic as related to the school include ongoing provisions for classroom collections, resources centers,and many other arrangements, some of them new, for multiple centers of various types to provide immediate accessibility under the direction and guidance of media specialists for teachers and students to get materials as they need them in connection with their educational program. We are emphasizing more, although again I would like to state it was in 1960 standards, it is in more vehemently this time - and that may not be the right term - under accessibility, standard hours of service. We are saying that it would be desirable if all schools kept their media centers open Saturdays and vacation periods, that the secondary schools must do this not only at these times, but also during evening hours. We are recommending that architectural plans in the future make provision for immediate access to the media center in the building, eliminating the problem of keeping the whole school building open; so that the media center can have its resources and services available at off-school, regular hours.

Another point that seems to me to have implications is that our recommendations for staff are such that we feel there will be sufficient staff to implement the program. For example, we are recommending one full-time media specialist, who not only has the professional education in media, but also meets teacher certification which is the important point about media specialists, schools librarians now, whatever they may be called; that they are also qualified and certified teachers. We are recommending that there be one full-time media specialist for every 250 students. In addition, there are other kinds of professional specialists who may not need teacher certification, but must have special competencies in any one of the following categories: direction and production of television, direction and production of motion pictures, direction and production content (all of this is content) of computerized instructional aids; those who are planning the programming for such developments, which may or may not be part of the former dial access programs, youth forums and video tape, and other electronic learning programs. Also language laboratories, which would be another type of specialist here, and the last in this category involves the computerized data retrieval specialist. In addition, the standards have indicated four categories of technicians and these are technicians now, not people responsible for the educational content for programming - electronics, photographic technicians, and television technicians. Also in this category, a highly qualified special expert, and that is the graphics artist or technician. When schools - and there is an increasing number who have at the building level their own TV program within the building and their own studios - when they have these specialists, it is marvelous. Where they have these programs in the building, there must then be one full-time professional TV specialist with full-time technician and so forth. Otherwise the schools depend on the standard of the district level for some of these services or will amplify that one for every 250, with the technicians and the professional specialists. In addition there are aides who do mimeographic, clerical, and a variety of other activities, including some floor work, and we are recommending here one aide for each professional media specialist. With these services, services that can come from the staff of this nature - and again I wish to repeat that this is not visionary recommendation for size of staff - we feel that the media program can be implemented to its fullest, which it has not been in the past. It means that we will be able to give better service to teachers and, certainly, increased services to teachers are a major part of the new programs, of the new standards. We envision daily consultation with teachers, full-time media specialists on each teaching team, continuous representation in curriculum planning and development, as well as the important work that goes on with the student.

The last part of my report - and this will be very, very brief - will try to show the relationship of the media center in the building to the backup services and other levels. I am not going into this in depth at this particular time. I would like to state that the standards so far have indicated that the State media center forms an integral part of the State Education Department for public instruction, a location that insures the highest degree of participation by the directors, staff, and program of the media center in the development and improvement of schools within the State, and that facilitates the provision of services extended by State level curriculum specialists and other personnel in that department.

Cooperation with the State Library is extremely important. Joint deliberations are in order with networks of library systems involving two or more types of libraries or media centers. But the State's media program's primary responsibilities are with the schools and other members of the State Education Department working in the elementary and secondary school fields, and these can best be met when the State media program has membership in and close identification with that part of the structure of the State department of public instruction that is directly concerned with elementary and secondary education.

We had the school media center in the building and the emphasis today is on accessibility of the materials for students and teachers within the schools as they need them. At the present time, in well over 800 situations in the country, we have district media centers; these are usually referred to as school library supervisory offices. They may be for one school system or they may be for many school systems. At this level today we find, coming from the center advisory services, centralized processing, many backup resources in relation to magazines, films, back files of magazines, professional films, materials for teachers that are not needed at the building level, rarely used materials, expensive materials, which are then loaned to the schools. We are recommending that the district media center also be a unified program as it is in innumerable school situations at the present time, with unified program as I defined it for you also at the building level.

Now appearing in the country and also very much in the thinking of this committee, although it may not receive as much attention in this version of the standards as in the next one, is another level called the Regional Media Center within the State. We have at least two states with this program underway. In North Carolina, for example, they have established regional media centers as has Pennsylvania, and it is the intent in this planning to have at the regional media center further backstop services for the district center and for the individual building center. Some feel that in the future all processing will be done at the regional media center, whereas cataloging may be done at a State or even a national center. Again we would have advisory services here, and so forth and so on. The trend or rather the primary viewpoints seem to be that of these regional media centers - and it is my own viewpoint which may or may not necessarily be correct - that no State would have more than ten of these. The viewpoint or the philosophy seems to be that these regional media centers should be under the direction of the State media program and, therefore, constitute an extension of those services. I state this to show that we have already, today, the building center and the system center, that these are not in the discussion stage. In concluding, may I again emphasize in pulling out just a few highlights, such as I have done, may be misleading; that we are primarily concerned with giving the necessary services to students and teachers. We feel because of the many ongoing developments which we have discussed that the areas that are represented here are helping to contribute to a very specialized, important branch of education which involves media center programs and the media center services.

Emerson Greenaway, Director, Free Library of Philadelphia

It really is a pleasure to be here and to share this platform with fellow Massachusettsians and also to share the platform with someone whom I have long admired. I am not sure how many "beans" I can spill this afternoon because the National Advisory Commission on Libraries report has not been officially released. What I am going to say as far as the point of view of the National Commission is concerned is perhaps a vague reminiscence of bits of testimony that have been presented to the Commission, and what may come out in the Commission report may be something else again.

The Commission listened to many, many people over the weeks and months that it was in operation; they heard many points of view, some of them more than once, and some of them with a great deal of interest. Those giving testimony recognized fully the problems that we all have to face. Many people noted that recent Federal legislation already has had a visible impact on secondary school library development. This is apparent the country over. We also were assured, and this we believe, that Federal legislation has in part encouraged a much greater local effort in library improvement. But even so, it was very apparent that the needs of our schools for books and other library materials, for adequate physical facilities, and for staff as well are so enormous that continued Federal assistance is necessary. So, we must not only think in terms of appropriations, but more importantly, in terms of authorizations, of expanded authorizations, and of greater appropriations where necessary. We believe that the laws on the books should be fully implemented so far as authorization is concerned, with appropriations to match the authorization.

There are a number of points that were brought out in the testimony offered - and some of them Dr. Henne has already commented on - such as provision for school libraries should be mandatory, and in construction or reconstruction there should be immediate exterior access to school libraries so that they can be available when the schools are not in session. That the disadvantaged child needs a great deal of special help was brought out time and again. This will require more attention than we have given in the past. There should be, of course, a more efficient use of materials, equipment, and personnel. Local and State school library agencies should be further encouraged to form community and regional systems to provide centralized consultation, acquisitions, and processing services for school library materials.

It was also of concern that there was not enough data on school libraries now available. It seems that every time a study is made, or proposed, and you go to assemble data, that the statistical information simply is not there. When I was in Hawaii last week, I suggested to a management firm that they would do well if they told the professional world, and in this instance the library world, the sort of statistics which they think are important and to tell us now in order to get ready for the survey that is bound to come 10 or 15 years hence. We seem not to have kept the kind of statistics that these people need. There was also agreement that investigation and study should be undertaken on the relative costs and utility of various types of library materials of the differing patterns of service, supervision, and library organization; of appropriate standards; and of various means of coordinating school library districts to provide centralized processing, consultant, and materials evaluation services. It was also pointed out that production of special library materials for children and disadvantaged or bilingual communities was also important.

Testimony was also given that possibly a new look at coordination with other agencies, especially the public library, was essential. As Dr. Henne spoke, referring to school library needs, I wondered where the public library people were, if they were not even there as observers. There did not seem to be very much cooperation at that point.

It also was apparent that we need some thinking and planning that is strictly new regarding the distribution of financial support to the various types of libraries within each region, if we are to serve the increasing demand of formal education.

It was noted that there is a heavy incidence of high school students' use of the public library and indeed this is also true of the elementary school level, as well as higher education. It was also very apparent that, in spite of the great strengthening of Federal support for the formal educational and public library areas, we still have many of the same problems facing us. We need an answer to the question: "How much is it going to take to solve all of our problems?"

In thinking of the work of the commission, I could not help but get back to some of the problems that we all face. I am sure that we as librarians want to solve library problems for the student and I hope that we are all big enough so that we can solve this problem and let the chips fall where they may; and that we come up with the kind of an organization that will do the job, rather than fan the flames of individual ideas or prejudices. We are sure that so many of the school libraries simply are inadequate. This is still true in urban areas as well as rural areas, although our standards improve periodically. I am glad Dr. Henne indicates that they are going to be reviewed every two years. I am not sure but that, with the explosions that we are experiencing in education, it may get down to a 12-month revision, rather than a 2-year revision. We know that there are great inadequacies related to student use in the public library field. We simply cannot meet the needs of students at the level of school library standards, and still serve adults in the community. We must find a solution.

We know that the effects of the implementation of Federal aid for library service under ESEA, NDEA, and LSCA have been great, but there are still great inequities. ESEA grants three times as much money for materials as the LSCA does. Title I in the LSCA is not only for materials, but also for other services and, hence, the disproportion of funds for materials is even greater. We do have in the LSCA Title II funds for construction, which provision is not in the ESEA, and this too is necessary for us but I am sure that in time construction funds must be made available for the schools because there are so many old schools that have inadequate centralized or classroom libraries that are in areas that were never designed for such use. Too many of them are on the second floor and not accessible directly to the outside world. The findings of the Deiches Study in Baltimore, and the question it raises on the responsibilities and practicalities for meeting student requirements, needs to be studied in great depth. We have already studied our program of service to young adults in Philadelphia, and we are going to conduct a number of experiments, which I will not have time to describe this afternoon, but we believe that it is going to help us in thinking through on this problem. One thing that I would like to emphasize so far as the school systems are concerned the country over - it seems to me there is a crying need to improve the reading and comprehension level of all high school graduates. As a public library librarian I am tired of having people come up and say, "You are not reaching the adults in your community." We cannot reach the adults in our community because they were not taught to read and comprehend when they were in school. It seems to me, that even more important than some of the new experimental methods is a basic attention to this area.

I have tried to review what some of the present student needs are, but we really do not know in full what they are; we have rural problems and we have urban problems. We have the bussing problems in both areas which effectively prevent after school use of the school libraries. We have the hours of inaccessibility, both in the schools and in the public libraries, because there are many rural libraries that are open infrequently and then only for a limited time. Accessibility to materials and service simply is not there. To try to determine total student problems, the Free Library of Philadelphia proposed to the board of education that a study of student library resources requirements in the city of Philadelphia be undertaken. Next week we shall present, the Free Library and the Board of Education, a program to the Office of Education, asking for funds to find out what library services we really need in Philadelphia, what is going to be the best way of giving service to the students, and how this service should be given. It is time to think of the student as a student and not just a public library or a school library user. I have tried to surmise what some of the possible solutions are. I do not think we have yet found the right answer, at least not in my point of view. The school libraries take care of the needs of the school child while that child is in school but when the school is closed, the school library also closes, and too quickly. The child is then forced to go to the public library, if there is one and it is open. From my point of view, and I may be completely prejudiced, it does not seem to me that there is the same atmosphere in the school library as the children find in the public library. I have seen in more than one place, where the public library, adjacent to a high school, will experience the fact that when high school is over, the public library is completely filled and, although the high school library remains open until 5 p.m., it is virtually empty. The students simply do not like to return to the school libraries if there is an alternative. Whether we are at fault in the public library in being too relaxed or whether we have the dating bureau for the teenagers, I am not certain, but I think we need to find some psychological means as to how we can encourage the students to go to the place where they can get the greatest amount of materials and service.

We have, perhaps, five possibilities of planning for and meeting student needs. One is that we can give the full responsibility of library service for all students to the schools. And when I speak of all students, I mean the students in the public school, the parochial school, and the private school. From a public library point of view, we have only students and whether they go to one type of school or another is immaterial to us. Or, as a second choice, we could give full responsibility for library service for all students to the public library. A third alternative would be to have local boards of education subsidize the public library, in order to give an equality of service to the students when the school libraries are not open. A fourth possibility would be to create something entirely new - a library authority - and this would be a move toward total library service. After all, we have other authorities, for you have a Transportation Authority here in New York. You may or may not like it, but it does take care of all kinds of transportation. A library authority could take care of all kinds of library services. I do not know that there would be dollar savings, but there might be more efficiency for the user of libraries than there is at the present. Library authorities might be even created on a regional basis, and indeed for those of you in metropolitan areas where service areas overlap, more than one State might be willing to join in the solving of a mutual problem. Our Free Library of Philadelphia in reality serves as a regional library. The students from the Glassboro State Teachers College, the Camden schools, and the other areas in New Jersey have no hesitation about crossing the river to get the materials that they need. They are forced to do so. How are we going to find answers to these solutions? We talk about cooperation but I really do not think that we really have it. If we really had cooperation, probably we would all drop dead! We like to talk about it. We have talked about it too many years and I think the time has come when we should and can do something about it. Remember Title III in the Library Services and Construction Act.

One of the things that I hope will come out of the National Commission's Report is the development of a program whereby the really great problems of library service will be adequately studied and recommendations be made. The next alternative to a national study, is to have a State library that is as alert as the New York State Library study the problem and make recommendations.

If this is not possible, certainly the State library associations could do this, and even if this is not possible, we could have local coordination and study in an attempt to find solutions on the local level. If we do not do this, I am sure that government itself may step in, or even groups of citizens, and try to find an answer. I would hope rather that we were ahead of them and that we could come in first with a plan that would be fully professional and which would meet the need of the student. No matter what route we take, I am sure it is going to take time and I am sure new legislation will be necessary. Solutions are difficult to arrive at, but I think we will be shirking our responsibility as librarians, for unless we find a real solution to the opportunities of giving service to students of all ages, not just in the elementary and secondary levels, instead of what we hope it will be in the future, will go down the drain.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION PERIOD - Dr. Henne and Mr. Greenaway

Following the presentations of Dr. Henne and Mr. Greenaway, two major questions in the discussion period were raised:

1. A definition of the concept of school library service in relation to public library service

2. If school libraries met standards, to what extent would students then use the public libraries or to what extent should students be expected to use public libraries and college libraries?

Dr. Henne stated that the fact that 50 percent of the users of the public library are students does not mean that 50 percent of the student body is coming to the public library - it actually is a small percentage of the students who go to the public library. Consequently the program in the school is reaching, or should reach, 100 percent of the students in school, and if it is not, then that is a substandard condition. The school librarian is a qualified teacher; the librarian in the public library is an educator also, but is not necessarily a specialist in elementary or secondary education. The school librarian has more access to information about an individual student to give optimum guidance and direction in the library. Accessibility, both in materials and services, is important in the library programs in the school where it may be done in conjunction with a classroom activity and as a part of the total school program. The school library has its own instructional program, and the public library has nothing comparable to this. Also the school librarian has many kinds of special opportunities to work with individual students in a variety of ways not related to curricular assignments. The school librarian's role in working with teachers is an extremely important one. Not only in helping them with the materials to use in their classes and having them motivate students to use these materials, but the media specialist also has the primary function today to keep the teacher in the school informed about development in his specialized field. A great part of the program requires knowledge of the curriculum, of instructional methods, of the learning process, of the characteristics of boys and girls. These are important specializations of school librarians.

Dr. Henne, in responding to the question regarding students' use of public libraries if standards were met, said that if the ALA standards were met in schools, she would feel that almost all school motivated assignments should be met with the resources of the school library. Expressed in terms of percentage it might even be as high as 99 percent. Also, in many situations the school library has backstop resources from a district center. The other part of the question - related to opportunities afforded the student, especially the high school student, to use all kinds of materials - was responded to as follows: "It is not a categorical statement that a student should never go to the public library. My own feeling is that any young person, practically any age, should have the right to review or listen to anything he wants to, and that all libraries will be supplementary in a sense. Although our high school libraries now have adult materials to the point of almost 95 percent of the collection, there are still a great many imaginative adult fiction and nonfiction works that I think would be a deprivation if the student could not have an opportunity to browse through, to read, and to select from."

There was general consensus on three other areas of concern:

1. The opportunity for public libraries to give full services to adults is one of the greatest challenges the public library has had.

2. New patterns of financial support are needed to adequately develop service to students and with it must come a justifiable rationale.

3. Emphasis must continue in the library schools to produce librarians who are trained to supervise the variety of media now found in libraries.

IMPACT OF CURRENT PROGRAMS ON STUDENT SERVICES

E. J. Josey, Academic and Research Libraries Consultant, Division of Library Development

"Two 3R's Pilot Programs: NYSILL and FACTS"

INTRODUCTION

I am delighted to have this opportunity to participate in this significant Conference on School/Public Library Relations. I characterize this conference as being significant, for in my opinion it represents the breadth, depth, and vitality of American librarianship. It is a realization that the arbitrary things that separate school librarians from public librarians are less important than the goals they have in common.

It is my task this afternoon to share with you the experience of the New York State Library in two statewide pilot projects. Before I discuss the New York State Interlibrary Loan pilot project and the Facsimile Transmission experiment, it may be prudent to say a few words about the Library Reference and Research Resources Program.

THE 3R's

To those of you who have been intimately connected with the Library Reference and Research Resources Program, a few of the comments that I will make may sound like twice told tales, but, in order to put NYSILL and FACTS in perspective, this is necessary.

The growth of the Reference and Research Library Resources Systems, or the 3R's, was the result of an urgent need to provide serious researchers and scholars immediate access to research library materials. Library leaders of the State were cognizant of the fact that the 22 public library systems were meeting the general reading and reference needs, but on the other hand, college students, graduate students, college faculty, scientists, researchers, and writers did not have access to the rich resources of special and private research libraries.

While it was of great importance for the educators and library leaders to give careful and earnest consideration to the research library demands of the growing number of students and faculty in colleges and universities, as well as the library demands of researchers in the industrial and scientific communities in New York State, it soon became apparent that efforts should be made to survey the distribution of research library materials in the State and determine if shared resources and facilities would be advantageous.

A study of location and distribution of research library resources revealed an unequal distribution of research materials, i.e., rich library research resources were concentrated in the large metropolitan areas which resulted in difficulty of access for citizens who lived great distances from these centers. Moreover, the access problem was compounded by the fact that the largest and richest library resources were private, therefore creating barriers to their use.

Essential to creative scholarship and research, undergraduates, graduate students, professors, and other researchers depend upon quick and easy access to a growing mountain of books, periodicals, monographs, and technical report literature. Thus, the avalanche of published scholarship from the publishers of the world is another great factor in the creation of the 3R's Systems.

I think that most people would agree that there were a variety of factors at work which hastened the development of the 3R's Regional Systems. More significantly, however, was the economics of the library situation, namely, that the number of publications and research materials was so great that the individual library - public, academic, or special - could not afford to buy even that portion of materials to support its own clientele or goals.

To solve the reference and research library needs of the State, the Commissioner of Education appointed a committee to study the problem which resulted in the *Report of the Commissioner's Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources* that was published in December 1961.

The history of the 3R's would not be complete without mentioning an occurrence which catapulted the reference and research library program - the Governor's Library Conference of 1965. Participants urged the use of the new technologies and State support for the reference and research library program, which led to the 3R's first appropriation of $700,000 that launched the 3R's in 1966.

Interest in the 3R's grew so rapidly until by May 31, 1967 nine regional systems composed of a voluntary association of college, public, special, and research libraries blanketed the entire State. That such a gigantic undertaking could be engineered in such a short period of time is a credit to the librarians and library-minded citizens in all nine regions of the State.

The Commissioner's Committee recommended a two-level approach for solving the reference and research library problem - regional and State. The two current programs I shall discuss this afternoon are part of the State's responsibility.

NYSILL

The New York State Interlibrary Loan Program, or NYSILL as it is commonly known, commenced in March 1967. NYSILL is positive action by the New York State Library to implement the 3R's program by providing the research community immediate access to research materials. This pilot project is a recognition that the State has an obligation to provide the scientist, lawyer, teacher, doctor, writer, college student, and college faculty or a person who has reached his 18th birthday access to research materials regardless of where he is located in the State and, for the first time historically, the serious researcher is not to be denied access because he could not visit the library where the material is held, or because the library is private. Since most of these libraries are private, it was the first time that many of them had ever lent their books and resources extramurally before.

Channel of inquiry

The direct channel that a serious library patron uses to procure advanced research materials from NYSILL is as follows: The advanced library patron initiates his request for research materials at the library which is most convenient or appropriate. If he submits his request to a public library and the materials are not available in the public library system, his request is sent by TWX via the public library system headquarters to the New York State Library. If the patron is a student, faculty member or researcher at a college or university, his library if it cannot fill the request submits the request to the State Library by TWX or mail. If the patron is a researcher in industry, his special library may submit the request directly to the State Library. In some instances where public library systems are backing up the 3R's regional communications network, they also submit requests for college, university, and special libraries patrons to the State Library.

As the monitor for the statewide interlibrary loan experiment, the State Library functions through a multiple switching capability which operates as follows: 1) the request will be filled from the resources of the State Library; 2) failure to be filled at the State Library, the request is then sent to three area referral centers that have been designated on a geographical basis - these centers are the Brooklyn Public Library, the Monroe County Library System, and the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library; 3) for materials which cannot be supplied by the New York State Library or the three referral centers, the State Library has contracted with nine private research libraries to serve as subject referral centers, and they fill requests within specified subject fields. In order to meet the demands of more rapid access to materials by patrons from college, university, and special libraries, the State Library now channels these requests directly to the subject resources centers rather than through the area referral centers.

The nine subject resources libraries are The New York Public Library (Research Libraries), Columbia University, Cornell University, New York University, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Engineering Societies Library, the New York Academy of Medicine, Teachers College, and Union Theological Seminary. The requested materials are sent directly from the subject resources centers to the library at which the inquiry originated.

Operational and experimental efforts

NYSILL represents a breakthrough in interlibrary relationships, for no other State in the Union has attempted on such a wide scale to ensure the serious library or the researcher access to research materials, wherever he may be located and whatever may be his affiliation. Yet, in any experimental or pilot program, there will be operational delays caused, in the main, by misinterpretation and unforeseen problems. In order to refine the procedures in NYSILL, a series of meetings were held in the State with interlibrary loan librarians to eradicate the difficulties. As a result of these meetings, a newly revised NYSILL manual was issued.

From the reports of the contracting libraries, success in the fulfilling of requests has risen tremendously. One of the NYSILL librarians indicated a 65 percent increase in referrals from her institution. Many of the delays and difficulties are slowly passing away. Much of the credit for improvement in NYSILL goes to the operational staff of contracting libraries and other reference and interlibrary loan librarians, which stems from the feedback received from the regional meetings. It is our belief that the revised manual which deals with such nuts-and-bolts operational procedures as full bibliographical citations, policy governing the loan of materials, and reports on interlibrary loan transactions, will ensure speedier access to the rich library resources of New York State.

The Future of NYSILL

Nelson Associates have been studying NYSILL and their evaluation is scheduled to be completed by March 1. In order to obtain grass-roots opinions from librarians and in order to come to grips with the results of the evaluation and alternatives for a possible redesign of a continuing statewide interlibrary loan program, the Division of Library Development is planning four regional meetings in March and April in the State. Individuals from 3R's systems, public library systems, college and university librarians, librarians of the NYSILL contracting libraries, members of the Commissioner's Committee on Library Development, and members of the Regents Advisory Council on Libraries will participate in these deliberations.

You are probably aware of the fact that the current NYSILL contracts with NYSILL libraries end March 31. However, NYSILL will proceed simultaneously with the deliberations and study of the program by short-term contracts for the interim period with these libraries, that will begin April 1 to June 30. It is our hope that a stronger, revised interlibrary loan network will begin July 1, 1968.

Residual benefits from NYSILL

Earlier in this paper I have alluded to residual benefits from NYSILL; however, there are others. Access to research materials through interlibrary loan in New York State is now almost a constitutional right, for no longer does the serious library user have to submit his request on blind faith or courtesy, for the private libraries will be compensated for their services and materials through their contractual relationship with the State Library. Secondly, because of the creation of the interlibrary loan network, the entire research community now shares access to resources that cannot be afforded locally. Thirdly, the local library does not have the responsibility of engaging in the identification process, for the Interlibrary Loan Unit of the State Library has the bibliographical tools and skills to make the subject analysis and refer the request to the most relevant source or to succeeding sources to be filled. Fourthly, even though the local library does not decide on the source where the request will ultimately go, it still has a most vital professional role to play, for in the final analysis it decides on who is a serious researcher, by definition and refinement of requests. Finally, the State Library's role in seeing that the NYSILL system is not overloaded or abused by keeping certain materials out of the current year, multiple requests for books on college reading lists, reference tools, genealogy, etc. is one of a backup resource and does not replace local resources. In short, each local library - public, college or special - will still provide basic bread-and-butter materials for its readers, but NYSILL opens up the comprehensive research collections to local readers.

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

The Governor's Conference of 1965 focused on two subjects: Firstly, the urgency for technological solutions to information storage and retrieval, and secondly, communication through rapid and efficient means of information and research materials from one library to another.

When Commissioner James E. Allen announced that a pilot project facsimile transmission network was to be established among libraries in New York State in January 1967, this was an attempt to fulfill one of the recommendations of the Governor's Conference by providing rapid communications between libraries. The program was so designed that within approximately four to five minutes, the transmission of a single 8"x11" page between libraries, via telephone lines, could be made. It was the aim of the network to have materials within the hands of patrons within 24 hours of the request.

The Network

FACTS, the acronym by which the facsimile transmission experiment is widely known, is composed of 15 stations; seven of these stations are both sending and receiving, while eight are only receiving stations:

1. New York State Library (Albany)
2. The New York Public Library (Research Libraries) (New York)
3. Columbia University (New York)
4. Cornell University (Ithaca)
5. New York Academy of Medicine (New York)
6. Buffalo and Erie County Public Library (Buffalo)
7. Pioneer Library System (Rochester)
8. Nassau Library System (Hempstead, L. I.)
9. Suffolk Cooperative Library System (Bellport, L. I.)
10. Westchester Library System (Mt. Vernon)
11. Mid-Hudson Libraries (Poughkeepsie)
12. Mid-York Library System (Utica)
13. State University of New York at Albany
14. State University of New York at Binghamton
15. State University of New York College at Potsdam

Equipment

When the FACTS program was envisioned, it was planned that both narrow-band and wide-band equipment would be used, so that the capabilities of both kinds of equipment could be tested simultaneously. Narrow-band equipment takes from 4 to 5 minutes per page and wide bands roughly 1 minute per page; however, it turned out that the aims and goals of the New York State Library were technologically ahead of the capabilities of the equipment, for it was possible to install only one wide-band facility, and this was rather late in the program.

The problem was further compounded by the differences in cost between narrow- and wide-band machines which made it possible to afford four units of the narrow-band equipment and still remain below the cost of a single wide-band installation.

Transmission problems

In any innovative experimental project there are bound to be difficulties. Some of these include orientation of personnel to operate the machines, poor legibility of copy because of poor telephone lines, lags between patron requests and patron receipts, and because viable workable delivery systems were not functioning in the regions, etc.

On the other hand, recent FACTS reports indicate that copy is now improving; the time response is now being cut down to 3 days in some instances, and this may be the result of the establishment of delivery systems in the 3R's regions.

The Future of FACTS

Nelson Associates are monitoring FACTS, and Lynn Hard, formerly of the Division of Library Development, is making the technical evaluation. The results of these two studies will determine the future of FACTS.

Viewing FACTS positively, it does provide physical access rapidly to researchers miles away from the subject resource centers. Although facsimile is technically feasible as the experiment proves, the industry must put in a substantial capital investment in research and development in order that satisfactory performance will prevail. The future configuration of FACTS is uncertain. In all probability, it will be drastically curtailed or suspended, however, the final decision will be made following the receipt of the Nelson Report.

While I was a graduate student in history at Columbia, I remember one of the professors warning us that in historical writing we must guard against overdrawing or underdrawing a topic. If it appears that I have overdrawn NYSILL and underdrawn FACTS, I am sure that you will forgive me, for facsimile transmission is only a means to an end, that is to say, it is only a communications medium in a much larger project to convey NYSILL requests to serious library users.

THE IMPACT OF THE NYSILL AND FACTS PROGRAMS ON STUDENT SERVICES

Although the NYSILL and FACTS programs are designed for the advanced research library user, it may first appear that students in public schools do not benefit from the program. Well, if you are simply using our definition of a person who is under 18 years of age and who is not a college student and may not be a college professor, doctor, lawyer, writer, scientist,or just an ordinary citizen engaged in research, then your impression is correct. But when you consider that public school teachers and school administrators, and other specialists such as guidance counselors, school nurses, and school social workers, who may live anyplace in the State, are now able to plug into the largest education library in the world when they submit a request through NYSILL, then your impression is incorrect, for in the long run, the student benefits. One way the school librarian can strengthen a cooperative relationship with his public library as well as make his faculty and school administrator aware that research resources are now available is by informing their colleagues about the NYSILL and FACTS program.

I do not wish to convey the impression that some enterprising school librarians are not doing this yeoman type of service, for the evidence indicates that research resources on teaching methods, educational subjects, resource materials in the subject areas of the teachers' specialty are being borrowed by teachers in the public schools through NYSILL, which necessarily follows then that the program is having an impact on students in public schools.

How to serve the advanced research needs of students in schools or how to do this best is still the crux of the problem. Essentially, the 3R's program was designed from the outset as an advanced research library program. In order to implement the Commissioner's Committee's philosophy of "building on strength" or utilizing the rich library resources that had already been assembled in the State, it was necessary to begin at the college level, for all of the academic and research libraries policies excluded high school students. This exclusion of high school students is not peculiar to New York State, for in a recent nationwide study, it was discovered that "the community group that appears closest to being genuinely unwelcome in American college and university libraries is the high school student segment."[1] Of course, in a few academic libraries, if students present a letter of introduction from their high school librarians, they are permitted to use resources in the buildings; however, research libraries seldom grant privileges.

Finally, we do not have all of the answers. NYSILL and FACTS are just a beginning, but with more experimentation and research, solutions will be found. The old stereotypes of each little library working alone die very hard. It is therefore necessary to convey and reconvey, time and time again, that the words library cooperation must move from rhetoric to reality.

---

1) Josey, E. J., et al. "Community Use of Academic Libraries." *College and Research Libraries*. vol. 29 (May 1967). pp. 197-198.

Edwin S. Holmgren, President, Association of New York Libraries for Technical Services (ANYLTS)

ANYLTS, or the Association of New York Libraries for Technical Services as it had been known before we contracted it, was formed a year ago in February 1967.

A little background for those of you who have not heard the story before: we formed this organization as a means of implementing a statewide acquisitions and cataloging center with associated processing units. There are various reasons why it all came about. In 1965, I think it was, the State Library retained Nelson Associates to study the existing processing centers in the various library systems across the State.

This study was to answer two main questions, phrased more elegantly, but they boiled down to "How many processing centers do we need?" and "What kind of catalog output should they produce?". After the study was finished, and it was done concurrently with the study of school situations and a study of the New York City Library, the Nelson Associates' answer was that there should be further consolidation; that in the interest of economy and efficiency we could consolidate into a single acquisitions-cataloging center and save an estimated $880,000 a year. They also recommended that there be a series of book catalogs for various areas supplemented by card catalogs from the local areas.

Following the receipt of this report, the Division of Library Development convened an advisory committee with sort of a progressive membership, I guess you would say. Each meeting of the committee had a slightly different membership to review this study and make further recommendations. The Advisory Committee went on record as being in favor of the principles of centralization and consolidation and called on the library systems of the State to go on record as being in favor of further consolidation and to set up an organization to implement it. The question of the book catalog or kind of catalog output was held in abeyance.

So, in February a year ago, representatives of the 22 library systems of New York State met in Albany, and did form ANYLTS. This left us with a board of nine trustees, no staff, and some liaison with the Division of Library Development - Dorothy Smith and Jean Connor.

Concurrently with this reporting, reviewing, and forming of the organization there were several other developments going on across the State that have direct bearing on ANYLTS. The Division of Library Development, anticipating some of our needs, contracted with Ted Stein, who had been associated with Nelson Associates in their work, for two computer design services. One of these was in the acquisitions field where he was doing a design primarily for the proposed State center (or ANYLTS), the other in the cataloging field where he was working with an advisory committee of librarians, coming up with a design that could be used by ANYLTS, The New York Public Library Reference Department, or anyone else that wanted to use it. The trustees have met with Ted to review his work, and we have reviewed various drafts and reports of his work, at this point. It is proposed that when the systems are decided on, that the State will do the programming, rather than ANYLTS itself.

Also meeting at this time was the TRI-LI Committee on Technical Services, which was composed of the administrative staff and technical services representatives of the three large New York City libraries, doing some work which later became valuable to us and which I will point out a little further on. A. D. Little was retained by the Bureau of School Libraries to draw up an implementation plan for the study done by the Nelson Associates to recommend plans for school libraries that came along concurrently with the public library report. This report has some implications which I will point out later. Concurrently, A. D. Little was doing, and has just completed, an automation plan for SUNY, so you can see that everybody is planning.

Getting started, as most of you know if you have been involved in starting something from scratch, is difficult. Since we had no staff and had very little money, it was suggested that we retain a consultant to develop an implementation program which would detail staffing needs for the next couple of years, would list issues and decisions which needed to be made, actions, and the recommended sequence of events, and would give us some guide as to rough costs. The Division of Library Development retained Nelson Associates and Ted Stein to do this implementation program for us. This blueprint which shows the way we should be developing was presented this fall. Their report, which I now call the "Little Red Report" (their first report was the "Big Red Report"), was received this fall and recommends 28 steps which need to be taken before or through the fall of 1968.

I will not go through all the steps because I do not think you would be interested in all of them, but the main steps that need to be done are these: most important is a test project. This test project was seen as coming in two phases. The first phase in which the computer design and procedures are tested, files are filled, the bugs worked out, and we see that we have something that will actually operate. The second phase of the test would involve adding additional units, drawing up files, and testing communications between different organizational units, and various administrative relationships. A location has to be found, uniform cataloging policies decided, staff hired, book committee formed, and they see us operational unfortunately no sooner than five to six years. When I say operational, I mean being able to offer service to anyone who wants it.

These steps have been taken during the past 12 months. We have applied for, and received, assurance of getting an LSCA grant to support our work for the coming year. This is most important, I am sure you realize. A committee on uniform cataloging policies and practices has been established which has already accomplished a great deal of work, starting with the basic agreements reached by the TRI-LI library committee. They have come up with a draft agreement for cataloging policies for adult and young adult fiction already, and we expect the final recommendations in hand within a month or so. Children's materials and nonbook materials, we hope, will be in final form by June. By then we hope we have a generally agreed upon uniform cataloging code. Actually, the agreement has proven to be much easier than we thought it might be, and we are very confident at this point.

A location committee has been set up and has chosen tentatively the area of Nassau County as the future location of the center, subject to the availability of suitable rentals and the choice of the pilot project. We are holding up final decision here on the selection of the director and the selection of the pilot project. A personnel committee was set up to draw specifications for staff, to find recruits, and we are currently in the process of receiving applications. We will soon be interviewing candidates for the position of director and hope that we will shortly have a staff, so that the board can turn over to it the important day-to-day work of the association.

At our last meeting in January, we set up what will be an important committee, I am sure, referred to originally as the book catalog committee, but now referred to as a catalog format committee - we are not trying to make up their minds one way or another. We hope that they will recommend a policy to the board, following whatever research, evaluation, and field reporting they need to do, on what the output of the center should be.

The trustees have met with representatives involved in, or have reviewed copies of the reports of the work of A. D. Little for the Bureau of School Libraries, the State Library automation proposals, and the SUNY automation proposals. The Education Department's staff has been very helpful to us in understanding and evaluating these proposals.

The trustees of ANYLTS are very concerned about duplication of effort and expenditure, and we are all hopeful that through meetings with representatives of SUNY, the schools, and the State Library that we will be able to work out areas of cooperation and coordination so that money and effort is spent in the best way; that those areas that are amenable to coordination are, in fact, coordinated.

It is a little bit hard to see right now what the place of the school will be in the total ANYLTS program. Nelson Associates has recommended that the schools proceed on their own, and that only those schools now receiving services through a library system be incorporated in ANYLTS as it comes along during the initial stages. The more recent A. D. Little report recommends that the school-centralized processing be either piggy backed with the SUNY system which, as I understand it, would primarily be a matter of coordination, using similar equipment but having a separate staff, or with ANYLTS, which would be a more coordinated effort with eventual consolidation of trustees.

It has been pointed out, both by Little and Nelson Associates, that the needs of the schools for cataloging and processing are not very different from the needs of public libraries. There are great differences in the area of paying bills, which seems to be a somewhat technical matter, but our needs for cataloging and related information are similar. The reasons, as I understand them, that Nelson Associates said that both should go their separate ways until it is proven that they should join together, relate primarily to the scale and the size of this thing. It is somewhat frightening just to think of one center for all the public libraries in the State, let alone to think of one center for all the public libraries and all the school libraries in the State. When you are thinking of something much bigger than anything we have had any experience with, it is a little difficult to envision what problems might result.

We are determined to explore all the possibilities and alternatives most carefully. I think it is very important in view of the comments made earlier about the financial support of the public libraries and school libraries that we be able to show our taxpayers that we are making the best possible use of their money. This is one field where we may be able to do this more easily than with some others.

In concluding, if you pardon my metaphors which came to me while my children were watching television - they get the friendly giant and the jolly green giant a little bit mixed up and I guess my metaphors are a little bit mixed up here, too - the board of trustees has assisted at the birth and is assisting with the nurture of an infant. He may grow up to become a friendly giant with the power to help, or he may turn into a Frankenstein who will turn on his masters, or he may never grow up because of indigestion. Nobody has ever bitten off this much before. The trustees are determined to do everything they can to help this infant grow up into a healthy, helpful specimen larger than we have known before, more powerful and a better aid to better library service for all our patrons.

Martin Brech, Associate, Bureau of School Libraries

Certain questions during the discussion period have added about one-half hour to my talk! Seriously, while there are no pat answers to such questions, I do hope to respond to them, either directly or indirectly, in my statement. I can not resist adding a pat answer at the very beginning, though; namely, that in a country as wealthy as ours everything which is educationally sound should be administratively feasible. We, as a nation, have no excuse to use the lack of money as a reason for incompetence or inadequacy. If we need to revise our tax structure, let us concentrate on that, rather than responding to our needed programs by saying: "It can't be done!" End of pat answer.

I have been asked to address myself to the following question: How does one evaluate the impact of current programs on student services? It is ironic that I am responding to this question rather than my Bureau Chief, Frank Stevens, because the USOE has called him and all other State School Library Supervisors to Washington to help solve the following problem: How does one evaluate the impact of current programs on student services? Accordingly, while Frank is engaged in the "nitty-gritty" of satisfying this growing demand for evaluation by the Federal Government, a demand which has been aptly characterized as planting a tree and then periodically pulling it up to examine its roots to see if it is growing, I will do what I can to share with you whatever indications of growth we have so far.

Fortunately, we had devised instruments for evaluation and had applied them before the impact of massive Federal aid was felt. Thus "before and after" studies are possible and are being conducted. We are beginning to detect a considerable improvement in the size of the few annual growth rings which have been laid down since Federal fertilizer was applied.

Quantitative statistics regarding circulation, school library holdings, etc. are, of course, relatively easy to come by, but a qualitative evaluation of the effect on the student is another matter. Most certainly, we can turn to achievement tests, measuring the improvements in performance regarding reading and learning, and these are valuable and are being used with favorable indications. However, we are primarily interested in changing student attitudes, hopefully to bring about a greater interest in reading and learning, a more wide-ranging curiosity, a willingness to objectively examine unpopular and controversial issues, a greater ability to retain information after the postexamination letdown, and, as a result of all this, a more vigorous lifelong habit of independent, self-directed study, and more reading, listening, and viewing pleasure.

There seems to be general agreement regarding the desirability of the above mentioned goals, and modern educational theory and research amply supports, indeed extols, the basis of a more library-oriented approach to education; namely, the value of independent study, individualized instruction and a multimedia approach to learning. There are few defenders, albeit too many practitioners, of the old method of spoon-feeding the latest revised standard version of the textbook by the teacher as the authority figure with the unique answer revealed in an encapsulated classroom.

Therefore, if we grant that the new approach to teaching methodology is far superior to the old, then the problem of proving the value of the school library should be considerably simplified.

We need only ask: Where can independent study with access to a wide range of learning resources in all media most readily take place, if not in the school library? And if in the school library, what better place to provide individualized guidance and instruction to the student, with the teacher and the librarian working as a team?

In fact, it is the need for this close team approach of teacher and librarian, the need to have the librarian intimately involved in curriculum planning and implementation, the need to have a library which is an integral part of the school program, functioning within the school during the school day, that explains why, for example, the Council of Chief State School Officers took care to carefully distinguish the role of the school library from the public library while at the same time emphasizing the need for cooperation. They stated the matter as follows:

> "The school library serves the community. Teachers and pupils are members of both the school and the community.
>
> "Public library service, including service from State, regional, county, and community libraries, may supplement but never supplant the school library. Service which replaces the school library impedes the development of school libraries to the detriment of service to teachers and pupils, and tends to separate library materials from instructional programs.
>
> "The school has the primary responsibility for instruction and guidance of children and youth in the community use of libraries, and encouraging pupils to use libraries for continuing self-education. School librarians, teachers, and public librarians should cooperate in planning instructional programs in the use of libraries for educational and recreational purposes.
>
> "Cooperative planning in the selection and utilization of materials for children and young people is the responsibility of school administrators, teachers, school librarians, and other community leaders concerned with youth. These principles apply in all types of communities and to all levels of schools. They can aid in cooperative solution of problems and in cooperative acceptance of opportunities concerning library services to students in any community."

I trust these remarks now give me the opportunity to describe our program of school library development with the blithe assumption that all agree on the basic need for this program.

We see, at present, a situation which may be described with the much used term "revolution," or even "explosion," to indicate the nature of the development in school libraries.

Overshadowing, undergirding, and supplementing all our efforts to improve school libraries is, of course, the ESEA Title II program, with a generous assist from Title I, Title III, and NDEA Title III, and, to some degree now, LSCA.

Largely as a result of the tremendous impact of Federal funding, we now see new school library media centers being developed in exgymnasiums and ex-cafeterias, we see additions to schools being constructed with libraries three times as large as our antiquated State aid formula covers. And most notably, new schools are now being constructed wherein the library is literally, physically, the heart of the school, with classrooms radiating out from this central focus.

The impact of the ESEA Title II program has been phenomenal for several reasons:

The allocation of over $8 million in Federal funds each year not quite doubled the State and local expenditures for school library resources, and thus vastly accelerated the acquisition of school library materials. This at a time when radical curriculum changes and new teaching methods are taxing the ability of school libraries to provide the resources necessary to undergird classroom programs and pupil needs. This funding also resulted in the increased interest on the part of school administrators and boards of education in their respective school library programs, particularly the ability to house the newly acquired materials and the availability of professional school library staff to administer the Title II materials effectively.

Formal and informal reports indicate that the increased availability of materials under the Title II program has resulted in the improvement of pupil achievement generally, particularly since assignments in such areas as the social studies and science require large quantities of materials which are up to date and varied enough to accommodate different reading levels and reading interests. It is also apparent that, in view of the rising costs of printed and published materials, the funds made available under Title II have enabled local public educational agencies to acquire resources which would otherwise not have been purchased and made available to children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools.

In regard to private school children and teachers, particularly those in Roman Catholic elementary schools, these continue to benefit exceedingly, since, prior to the Title II program the availability of printed and published materials in private schools was limited and data on local effort indicate that expenditures for Title II resources in private schools have been maintained at a level well below that of public schools for similar materials.

Although it was anticipated that a sizeable amount of Title II funding would be used for the acquisition of other instructional materials, the statistical data indicate that such materials were given low priority in Title II project planning. While a major reason for this was the implementation of the new State Textbook Law, it is also apparent that educational programs in this State require a far greater amount of school library resources in order to complement and undergird the curriculum and provide a variety of resource and enrichment materials for individual research and other reading assignments. In this regard, it should also be noted that reports from public library officials continue to reveal that student use of the public libraries has leveled off and, in some instances, has been reduced, clearly indicating that increased educational opportunity through the school libraries under Titles I and II has offset some of the need for the utilization of public libraries for school assignments.

The reaction from public and private school educators and the general public to the Title II program in this State continues to be positive, and a great deal of interest and concern over the program has been evoked. School librarians, in particular, welcome this program and discern in it the potential and the opportunity for improving not only school library holdings but also for developing school libraries as true materials centers in order to meet the challenge and the needs of a modern educational program. School administrators have had underscored for them the importance of improved school library resources and school library services, and many of them are reexamining their present situations and planning for further improvements.

The challenge to public school administrators to assume a measure of responsibility for the educational needs of private school children and teachers is being met admirably throughout the State, particularly in the large cities, and their efforts in this regard continue to be successful. Private school officials, for their part, have cooperated effectively and endeavored to assume a large measure of responsibility for the smooth and efficient administration of program procedures at the local levels.

School library supervisors, in meeting the new responsibilities of the Title II program, have found that added impetus has been given to their local programs, and that the increased funding has enabled them to make improvements at a greater rate than before. And school library supervision, where none existed before, has been added to many public and private school programs.

Aside from the small minority of people who are unalterably opposed to federally-aided programs of any kind, the general public has welcomed the benefits of the Title II program and has indicated, through its local boards of education, support and approval for the new opportunities which will directly contribute to the increased effectiveness and excellence of the instructional programs in elementary and secondary schools.

Data also indicates that local expenditures for school library materials have not only been maintained but, in some degree, have been increased.

The Title II program has been effectively coordinated with other programs of Federal financial assistance, particularly ESEA Titles I and III, and NDEA Title III. Under ESEA Title I, 110 school library projects were funded during FY 1967, and it is evident that at least that many will be funded during FY 1968. Efforts to increase the number of school library projects will continue, however, since over 600 reading projects have been funded under Title I in this State, indicating that school library service should also be substantially improved in order to meet new demands for appropriate reading materials to undergird the reading programs.

Under ESEA Title III, several additional school library projects and multimedia programs have either been planned or made operational since the beginning of this program. In addition to local projects, supplementary educational centers have been created, enabling us to establish regional library service.

Regarding our preparation for Title II, I should mention some of the things we have done to make it possible to evaluate this program. The most significant instrument for evaluation we prepared was a multipage questionnaire submitted to all schools, entitled, "Survey of School Libraries and Instructional Materials." This revealed the situation existing in school libraries as of June 1965; that is, prior to the ESEA Title II program. This survey was initiated and conducted by the Bureau of School Libraries in order to gather data to assist with the revision of school library standards and to further determine the greatest relative needs for Title II materials. This information, by the way, has been key punched and is available through data processing so we can effectively use this material and find many interrelationships which are significant, thanks to this new technology.

In addition to this study, the Division of Research and Evaluation has initiated a status study of school libraries to determine the effectiveness of the Title II program as it continues through the years. We also will repeat our own survey in 2 or 3 years to see the difference, the "before and after" impact of Federal funding.

We also have had studies of the feasibility of school library centralized processing which were mentioned earlier, so I will not go into detail on that. We have, as mentioned, had a second study by the Arthur D. Little Company. They recommend primarily that we tie into the SUNY system, taking advantage of their very sophisticated computer. The disc pack, random access capability provided, and the proposed program far exceed anything available anywhere else, including the current public library program. Therefore, we are thinking of moving in that direction.

The statement has been made that this new breed, the media specialist, does not exist. To help produce more of this breed, we have appointed a certification committee consisting of members of the library school administration, school librarians, and school administrators. Together we hope to come up with new certification requirements for school librarians and establish, more firmly, the position of a school library supervisor or director. These individuals would be required to have both the traditional school library courses and courses in audiovisual materials, as well as courses in administration and in curriculum development. The director of school libraries would be required to receive about 60 hours beyond a bachelor's degree. But the ordinary school library or media specialist in the individual building will be aided by the library schools, since they will begin to combine courses. That is, where we now have a separate course on cataloging book materials we would have a course on cataloging all kinds of media, and where we have a course concerning bibliographic control, selection aids, etc., this would include nonbook materials. In other words, audiovisual courses would be combined with the traditional library program. This is being done to some degree now and will be accelerated.

To continue my progress report on Title II, I am happy to state that 2 years after the inception of ESEA Title II a considerable number of school districts in New York State have attained or are approaching State standards for school library resources and instructional materials. Available statistical data indicates that approximately 1.5 million volumes were added to the school libraries of the State every year by Title II. Of these, 40 percent were acquired by elementary school libraries, where the greatest need continued to exist. Thus Title II added slightly more than one-third volume per pupil, which in conjunction with State and local expenditures provided an additional volume for each child in the public and private schools of the State. On this basis it can be estimated that the schools of the State are within three to four volumes per pupil of attaining recommended State standards.

The number of periodical titles available in school libraries falls approximately 40 percent below highest State standards. This, despite the fact that more than 21,000 subscriptions were acquired with ESEA Title II funds last year alone, and that additional State and local funds were allocated to this category. It should be recognized, however, that growing collections of periodicals on microfilm are reflected in greater expenditures for audiovisual materials, rather than for periodicals.

Approximately 14 percent of the State allocation was expended for the acquisition of nonbook materials. Ninety percent of these funds were used for audiovisual resources, but holdings in this area do not yet approach recommended State standards.

I have mentioned State standards to you. We wish to demonstrate the value of the new forthcoming national standards, so we have, through our Special Purpose Grant program, funded a school this year which will meet the new proposed national standards. In fact, since what we hear is that the proposed standards have been revised downward slightly, this new school will probably exceed the new joint standards being proposed by AASL and DAVI. Incidentally, this school saw fit to use its own money to hire six media specialists for 1,200 students: one per 200. Frances Henne recommended one per 250.

It can be done.

There are several indications that the criteria used for the selection of Title II materials was increasingly effective in assuring quality acquisition of eligible resources. A review at the State level of all purchase orders indicated that even less ineligible and sectarian material was ordered than was the case in previous years and that local educational agencies had little trouble in adhering to program priorities and objectives. The number of local educational agencies that adopted a written selection policy as recommended by the Education Department more than doubled to approximately 330. Fifty-two additional titles were added to the list of suggested selection tools that was included in the Title II *Planning Guide* and the wide use of this bibliography has been reflected in the high quality of the materials acquired.

In order to further facilitate the use of quality selection tools by the local educational agencies, special ESEA Title II grants (minigrants) of $2,000 each were made to 14 regional supplementary educational centers established throughout New York State under ESEA Title III. A major portion of each minigrant was utilized to acquire all the selection tools listed in the ESEA Title II *Planning Guide*. In addition, a collection of professional reference books was purchased by each center based on local needs. These collections are available to local educational agencies being served by the Title III centers.

It is estimated that, both directly and indirectly, the Title II program in this State resulted in the employment of approximately 500 school librarians, media specialists, and nonprofessionals.

In our editions of *LAMP - Library and Multimedia Projects*, we briefly describe innovative programs designed to strengthen the quality of school library service in the public and private schools of New York State. These outstanding projects, funded under the Special Purpose Grant portion of the State program, serve as models of exemplary practices. In these projects we do not simply try to create an IMC in isolation in the school. We look at the school's program. We look for schools which emphasize the practices which I mentioned earlier: independent study, individualized instruction, a multimedia approach to learning. Where this type of program is given, where a school initiates an inservice program for its faculty to reorient them to this approach, this is the kind of school we will find.

We have visited most of the Special Purpose Grant schools that were funded the first year and we find that there is a terrific response on the part of the administrators, the faculty, and of course, the librarians.

We also responded to the increasing development of the primary school, the K-2 school. Here we find that the special development of these primary school library programs helped to establish the conception of both a primary and an intermediate library in the same school. They are no longer thought of as simply elementary school libraries. Now there are two libraries and their programs are considerably different. We have tried to aid this development through funding and guidance.

We have funded in-service education programs throughout the State. I will simply mention two of them by name. One was entitled "Exploring New Techniques in Young Adult Literature." Another was called "Toward a Multi-Media Learning Center." Each year there were 10 or so regional workshops on ESEA Title II. Four workshops on school librarianship were conducted last year, held in Buffalo, Hurleyville, Olean, and Watertown. We had a special convocation at the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, where for the first time school librarians, administrators, and teachers worked together as a team to plan a new developing program in our schools. There have been many special advisory meetings regarding school library programs. We have an advisory committee on school library standards and another directly concerned with the Title II program.

The staff of the Bureau of School Libraries has made many supervisory and other visits to various schools to help plan and evaluate programs. While we sometimes see evidence of improved student achievement where schools have significantly improved their school library resources, more evidence will be forthcoming for the response to these resources is obviously not always instantaneous. Since we are trying to develop reading and learning habits in students, it is evident that the best results come from starting in kindergarten and working up, rather than suddenly pouring in great quantities of material at the high school level. Accordingly, we have been giving highest priority to the elementary school level where, unfortunately, the need is also greatest, as evidenced by Frances Henne's earlier comments regarding the national picture. We have seen a dramatic improvement in New York State since the inception of Title II, a one-year drop from 40 percent to 30 percent in the number of elementary schools without libraries. We expect a continued acceleration in the development of elementary school libraries, aided by our creation of a new Title II program, using what we call a Special Purpose Incentive Grant. This is limited to elementary schools which were in existence last year but did not have a library. If they are willing to start an elementary school library this year and meet our standards, they will receive up to $20,000 for materials. The response has been gratifying.

In all our programs we try to encourage the development of materials centers and find that school librarians and administrators report an increasing interest in and implementation of the instructional materials center concept. Thirty-four ESEA Title II Special Purpose Grants were made in FY 1967 for materials to be utilized in instructional materials centers, almost double the number made in the previous year. Reports from the field also indicate that Title II has stimulated increased local financial resources in support of the IMC concept.

Some progress is being made in the improvement of relationships between the school library and audiovisual fields. On the State level professional audiovisualists have accepted invitations to participate in ESEA Title II regional meetings, bureau evaluation sessions, and, as observers, in Title II advisory committee meetings. Reciprocal participation in audiovisual conferences, convocations, workshops, and consultative meetings also has increased. On the local level it has been determined that there is a slow but perceptible trend toward cooperation. Efforts are continuing on both levels to develop opportunities for dialogue and cooperation.

As for school-public library progress under ESEA Title II, it should be mentioned that we seem to be the only State which includes public libraries in this program and has hired a school-public library liaison person.

As an example of the cooperative efforts aided by this funding, I will mention that the Nioga Library System received a $40,000 special purpose grant in 1965-66 to develop supplementary and enrichment materials in the social studies area for student use. They received a supplemental grant in 1966-67 of $10,000 to further develop this project.

The Hempstead Public Library in 1966-67 received a grant of $4,000 to

The Hempstead Public Library in 1966-67 received a grant of $4,000 to establish a Children's Center for Foreign Language Materials of books, magazines, and recordings in the six languages taught in district schools: French, Spanish, German, Italian, Polish, and Greek.

Public library systems and central libraries received from the school-public library liaison packets of 100 curriculum items to help them provide backstopping service to the local public libraries and schools in their area. They also received bibliographies of selected materials in the area of the performing arts which were distributed to 400 school librarians and other school personnel at two workshops held at Lincoln Center. Public libraries also received a list for a basic industrial arts collection prepared by the State Education Department. In visits by the school-public library liaison consultant to 14 of the 22 library system headquarters, ways in which the public library could cooperate with schools were discussed. One item in particular which was stressed was the availability of the selection aids for book and nonbook materials which appear in the supplement to the *Planning Guide* for ESEA Title II issued by the New York State Education Department, Bureau of School Libraries.

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been of tremendous influence in advancing school library service by strengthening existing facilities and encouraging the development of new library centers. The requirement that ESEA and LSCA avoid unnecessary duplication has furthered the cooperation and coordination between schools and public libraries that has only been talk for decades by having people from the two agencies involved in the planning and submission of special purpose grants. Incidentally, we require every school applying for a grant to answer a question on the application form, namely: "Have local or regional public library officials had the opportunity to participate in the planning of this project? If 'No,' explain." As a partial result, many of the library systems, such as Suffolk, Nassau, Nioga, and Mid-York have come to the aid of the public schools by contracting to process and catalog their ESEA materials.

I will end now by getting back to the prime focus of all this activity: the student. To aid us in this effort to focus, perhaps we ought to let the student describe himself. One of the best I have come across goes as follows:

> "As a busily growing animal, I am scatter-brained and entirely lacking in mental application. Having no desire at present to expend my precious energies upon the pursuit of knowledge, I shall not make the slightest attempt to assist you in your attempts to impart it.
>
> "If you can capture my unwilling attention and goad me by stern measures into the requisite activity, I shall dislike you intensely, but I shall respect you.
>
> "If you fail, I shall regard you with the contempt you deserve, and probably do my best, in a jolly, high-spirited way, to make your life a hell upon earth. And what can be fairer than that?"*

I am sure you all detect the large germ of truth in that description, but I trust you also detect the unfortunate traces of the old teaching methodology implied therein.

Hopefully, when we achieve adequate media centers and a more library-centered, and therefore child-centered, approach to education, the old approach of goading them from behind will no longer prevail. Instead, we will primarily need only to guide this no longer quite so naked but still so curious ape in his enthusiastic efforts to lift all veils of ignorance.

---

*Ian Hay from "The Housemaster"

PATTERNS IN PROMOTING COOPERATIVE LIBRARY SERVICE

Andrew Geddes, Director, Nassau Library System

When I first received this request to talk, I must admit to having some misgivings. For more than 50 years we have attempted to do just that - Promote Service and Cooperation. Why do we presume to think more talk now will do some good? Well, to some extent the climate has changed - budgets are being defeated, taxpayers are restless, legislators are asking for program review. But more than this, a few farseeing librarians have convinced legislators that library service patterns can be changed and legislators have said "Here's some money. Prove it." Unfortunately most of these legislative programs to date are oriented toward funding by type of library although certain provisions of ESEA, LSCA, etc., do permit interlibrary cooperation.

Administrators, I must admit, are also changing their views and attitudes as they see budgets defeated on one hand and Federal money become available on the other. But let us not kid ourselves! Developing new patterns, breaking old molds, pinpointing cooperative areas is hard work and the work generally has to be added to an already heavy workload. Thus unless this "think time" activity is supported and endorsed by the governing body - school superintendent, board of education, board of trustees, etc. - it is not going to get a high priority despite money. So proposition number 1 to accomplish our goal of promoting library service and cooperation is to have State, county, local agencies, and library associations impress upon governing bodies the need to pursue these cooperative programs. This is a very elementary proposal but not a single governing body I know of has ever suggested anything other than that a new activity be sandwiched into day-to-day workloads. Development of cooperative efforts would not be so difficult of achievement if one were given time to plan.

We must find time. Patrons (and therefore taxpayers) fortunately are not as aware as we are of the inadequate service which often carries the designation "library." The word "library" stands inviolate with "mother," "flag," and "country." Thus Podunk Library is hallowed in most people's minds equally with The New York Public. It is also fortunate that the taxpayers are not aware of the duplication and waste which exists fostered by lack of coordination and cooperation. Just look at what is happening and is being actively encouraged.

In the school libraries we run the gamut of classroom collections, local inschool libraries, district central libraries, multidistrict libraries, including both BOCES and Title III centers, and finally at State level - the Bureau of Libraries under an Assistant Commissioner for Instructional Services.

Public libraries have their own brand of proliferation - reading centers, community libraries, central libraries, systems, and the Bureau of Public Libraries in the Division of Library Development under an Assistant Commissioner for Libraries. In addition, there are a host of other library organizations doing business - community colleges, State and private universities, regional resources councils with a Bureau of Academic and Research Libraries in the Division of Library Development for coordination of these activities. Backing up all types of libraries with resources is the State Library under the State

Librarian who is an Assistant Commissioner of Libraries and who has jurisdiction over two of the three bureaus concerned with library service.

Beyond this, I am sorry to say, there is ever-growing fragmentation. This multiplicity is encouraged by law, by participation, and by support and all are running in somewhat parallel fashion.

Fundamentally all types of libraries share in the following:

a) a sincere belief in the purpose and reason for their existence;
b) a set of goals which are related to their programs; and
c) a genuine concern for services.

Similarly the users of these libraries have certain common needs and attitudes toward their library:

a) they believe their needs for library resources should be met regardless of where they live, or their financial situation; and
b) that access to the materials should be based on individual need and purpose unhindered by any artificial barrier such as age, race, or library organization.

Yet despite this communality of goals and ideals, we have a variety of organizational patterns by type of library service such as systems, ANYLTS or SLOCAP, and also by type of use such as 3R's councils, Technical Services Asst. Agencies, etc. Many of these groups exist at the same time and in the same area. They are being actively encouraged and more will arise. Instead of building on existing programs, strengthening and reforming them as needed, proliferation is mistaken for panacea.

And this worries me! Provision must be made at the State level for the systematic development of coordinated, unified library goals for New York State residents instead of fragmented self-serving splinters. We may all have to give up something to accomplish this end - status, prestige, title, money, even jobs where necessary. My wildest speculations tell me this can only be done through a Department of Libraries with a Commissioner having powers to develop standards for chartering libraries, to certify libraries as we now certify librarians, to issue opinions with the force of law, and in other ways to develop and enforce an overall program of high quality library service for New York State. Impossible dream? Perhaps. I submit individuals can promote library service and cooperation but they cannot do it efficiently and effectively outside the framework of an overall coordinated statewide approach. So that is proposition number 2 - create a Department of Libraries at the Commissioner's level.

Because we must be realistic and the foregoing proposal is just too threatening for most librarians at this state of the game, what can be done? Cooperation of course implies a two-way street - a partnership. What do I get? What do I give? If one library is constantly giving, then the other is not a cooperating agency, it is a parasite. And so we come to proposition number 3. The State, through its various agencies, must strive vigorously to develop, to implement, and to enforce realistic qualitative and quantitative standards of performance and support for all local units. By so doing, all cooperating agencies in a regional group would become partners in cooperation.

But the State agencies must not stop at that point. Larger units of service need to be created, embracing many types of library outlets. Because all libraries will be partners in cooperation, this new larger unit will be dominated by no one type of library. All will subordinate their needs to those of the area. New sources and methods of financing will have to be developed to implement such planning. By imaginative thinking such a program is possible. The Metropolitan Library Service Agency, recommended for Minneapolis and St. Paul, is one example of a creative approach to regional service. This is a comprehensive solution to the problem of a seven-county area. So proposition number 4 is the need to develop plans for an integrated series of regional service units capable of providing area library service to all types of libraries.

We need to examine present cooperative patterns and perhaps to admit that some mistakes may have been made or that circumstances which originally dictated one approach now suggest others. Perhaps systems organized among similar types of libraries should not exist as they do in New York. Maybe a new structure which embraces a variety of functions in a system setup might better serve our needs and perform both the functions of 3R's groups and those assigned to ANYLTS, BOCES, or other groups. Yes, even functions now thought to be solely the province of school and college libraries.

Do you believe that if we could start from scratch we would develop our library program in N.Y. in the same way? I think not. If we would do it differently if we could, should we not now, by modification, try to approach the better way? Given good will on all sides, my answer is "Yes." I can conceive of no reasons other than unwillingness or shortsightedness why aspects of school, college, and public library service could not be offered by a new supra unit on a coordinated cooperation basis.

A comprehensive approach demands intensive liaison and communication and that statement leads to proposition number 5. Existing avenues of communication must be enlarged and new avenues developed. Few people in this room could give a substantial or comprehensive review of library programs underway in New York at this moment. This is most unfortunate because many of us in the field are therefore making decisions in the dark, not knowing or having the time to learn of the successes and failures of others. A clearinghouse of reports, data, exhibits, etc., cataloged and indexed for ready reference needs to be established at a centralized information department. It is regrettable that as a professional group we do not have available for ourselves the very services we urge upon our patrons as one of the basic reasons for the existence of libraries - the storage and retrieval of information.

A final proposition number 6 suggests that, above all, provision must be made for continuous review and evaluation, continuous planning, and even replanning and finally, much crystal gazing on a cooperative and regular basis. In New York State hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent on library service. No industry spending this amount would try to exist without a research and development unit. New York should consider the possibility of such a unit attached to a library school or to a State agency - for only in this way can program evaluation be made an effective year-round function.

I have really made no suggestions for immediate programs of cooperation - mine have been of the long-range, and more than likely, of the impossible-to-achieve variety. I would like, therefore, to leave you with something of a practical nature upon which to work. Three areas lend themselves to cooperative endeavors - resources (library material), personnel (particularly specialized personnel), and facilities (including production capabilities). Within these, there are some short-range items that might be considered and developed. They are not new or unique, however. They are, in fact, quite usual services but they are also services which few, if any, regions are offering on any scale.

Resources

Cooperative buying programs could be developed by libraries in a region in order to save on duplication of costly, rare, and infrequently used books, periodicals, and pamphlets, etc. Cooperative centers could also be developed for storage of lesser used or seasonal materials and finally provision for last copy preservation and retention of historical materials could be made. From this beginning it is only a step to a Union Catalog and a Union List of Serials. These developments are obvious but any regional group of libraries could achieve them with little effort if they would try, if they had the time, and if they had the money.

Personnel

In the area of personnel, specialized staff should be shared by all types of libraries in a region on a reciprocal or contract basis so that the provision of highly qualified staff does not result in a duplication of costs and a financial burden. Further joint action in on-the-job training and inservice training programs could be developed which would lead to an upgrading of services throughout the region and would create greater awareness of regional needs and problems.

A regional approach to service would enable new specialists to be hired because their services could be justified. Specialists in planning and design of buildings, specialists in developing increased financial support such as project writers, and management analysts are some examples. Not only could these individuals lead to better use of present funds but they might also develop entirely new sources. A legislative liaison person, capable of tapping all possible sources of funding for a region, might return his salary tenfold in a year while improving the service capability of the regional group.

Facilities

In facilities, joint planning might lead to a joint storage facility. This would free public areas of infrequently used materials and save money through less need for expansion. Joint evaluation of materials and the processing of those materials deserves much consideration but a regional operation could go beyond these obvious items to the actual creation of resources based on regional needs - special bibliographies, computer printouts, AV materials for special situations, 8mm.training loops, closed circuit TV for book selection, workshops, and other functions. Of cooperative possibilities, there is no end. Ralph Shaw once said ideas are a dime a dozen - any fool can dream them up.

This fool has given you his dreams:

1. Governing bodies must be made aware of the tremendous time needed to develop cooperative programs and budget accordingly.

2. A coordinated program of service must be developed under a Commissioner of Libraries endowed with legal powers.

3. A program of quantitative and qualitative standards must be developed, implemented, and enforced.

4. Effort must be made to develop larger units of services including all types of libraries in an area.

5. Improvement in communication and the development of a library information clearinghouse is essential.

6. Provision must be made for continuous evaluation, revision, and planning.

7. A number of short-term regional cooperative efforts should be undertaken while waiting for the long-term projects to get underway.

After summarizing these points for you I am glad that I was asked only to suggest possible ways to promote library service and cooperation. I leave it to you to implement these recommendations. Thank you.

John Mackenzie Cory, Deputy Director, The New York Public Library

It seems to me that our two speakers before me on the panel this morning are in at least partial healthy disagreement, so I do not have to agree with either of them, and I do not have to make further apology for viewing my own line which may seem sometimes to zigzag back and forth between their two positions. This line is not a new line, for when Frances Henne and I were fellow students at the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago a few years ago, the discussion continued hot and heavy over the respective responsibilities of schools and public libraries. I think Frances and I came to agreement that it was not proper for the public library to provide all services to school age children; that it would not, could not, and should not do so. I think we probably continued to disagree, however, as to whether it was proper for the school library to provide all services for school age children. I did not deny that it might be proper, but I think it will be another generation, and the delay stems not so much from rivalry between librarian groups as between a commitment to formal instruction, related library service, and a commitment to informal voluntary individual service. This is a commitment that is high above the librarian and, to a certain extent, determines some of our competitive patterns. My remarks this morning will inevitably be chiefly personal although at times, and I will so indicate, they will reflect New York Public Library's philosophy and plan.

First as to philosophy, I suggest that we are equally concerned with library service from the point of view of the user and the taxpayer. This is the point of view with which we both must be concerned. From the taxpayer's point of view it should not matter where library service to the school age group is provided, as long as there is no unnecessary duplication, and I stress this point because this is the sticking point on seeking public funds by public libraries and school libraries for service to this group. We have to be able to prove that we are not providing unnecessary duplication. From the user's point of view, he simply wants library service and I suggest that the pattern of referring to the library, which Dr. Darling criticized public librarians for, instead of being abandoned by public librarians, be adopted by the school librarians. Every user thinks of the library, or my library, depending on which library you are going to use. This is a healthy rather than unhealthy point of view. This is a position which my successor as chief of branch libraries, Mrs. Godfrey, who is here, often takes and I believe it is a sound position. Each user has his library; actually often he has several libraries and often variously refers to them as his library.

Dr. Darling indicated, and I agree with him, that it is probable that the primary responsibility of the school library, and where possible the total responsibility, is for curriculum related services. That is, the school library media center must provide the primary needs of the users from that school excluding insofar as they can meet these needs, the public library from this responsibility. A shared responsibility, at least at the present stage of school and public library development, probably exists in school and public libraries for creative use of leisure time or preparation for the use of a library system which will continue to be available to the user after he ceases to be school affiliated. And I suggest that there is, and this is part of the problem today, that there is a residuary responsibility in the public library to meet the needs of any member of the body politic which are not being met as well, or better, elsewhere. This puts a good deal of impetus behind any drives for school library improvement. School libraries can expect the public library to abandon its concern for the school age groups only when it can meet the need of that group. I think you will find that the public library will yield this residuary responsibility to the school library as fast as the school library can take them on, but the fears of continued competition are perhaps exaggerated. Dr. Darling also indicated that it was not his role to define the primary responsibility of the public library. I guess that falls to me; I suggest that it is the public library's primary responsibility to serve the unaffiliated, or at least to serve users in their unaffiliated capacities. This I believe you will realize is consistent with my feeling that the public library has a residuary responsibility as the broadest-base publicly supported library, so we must yield our responsibility, our primary responsibility, when there is another agency which has a claim through affiliation of its users and is in a position to meet those needs, and we must exercise our responsibility when those users come to us in their unaffiliated capacities.

Despite the feeling of primary responsibility on the part of the school library to serve the school age group, and I believe this would be considered to be an official policy of The New York Public Library policy as well as my own personal philosophy, despite this fact in exercising this residuary responsibility, it is certainly true that about half of the users of The New York Public Library are school age groups. I did not say half of it is school related because I would suppose that percentage would be much smaller - some of it is in the area of shared responsibility for creative use of leisure time, some of it is in the residuary area of responsibility of serving people in their unaffiliated capacities. Nevertheless, we find a public library which is committed to the concept of primary school library responsibility to its users, still exercising a very great deal of time and spending a great deal of money in service to the school age groups. This is a paradox which requires some explanation, and it is a paradox based on a problem. It is the problem of the school library viewed from the public librarian's point of view.

In the first place there was until a number of years ago - not too many years at this time - the problem of the lack of staff, materials, and space in the school libraries to meet the needs of the school age user. I know when Mrs. Cory and I visited Japan about 10 years ago, it was a great pleasure and somewhat of a surprise to see the Japanese school libraries. The public library system in Japan was not fully developed at that time, but in every school library, elementary or secondary, there was a large, flourishing, and often quite modern and attractive school library. At that time the number of elementary school libraries in New York City with full-time librarians was minimal, and there was a sharp contrast between the development of school library service and public library service in Japan and in New York City. Fortunately this situation, the availability of staff, materials, and space, has markedly improved and curiously enough, it has markedly improved through the use basically of earmarked funds which we in our adherence to cooperation sometimes decry. Only through the availability of Federal funds, earmarked for school libraries, have the school libraries been able to eliminate some of the deficiencies in staff, materials, and space. As they have done so, they have quite properly assumed a larger share of library service with the full blessing and support of the public library, and I am speaking here of The New York Public Library. Unfortunately, the number of school students and the broadening demands of school students have more than absorbed the additional availability of staff, resources, and space as the school libraries have been strengthened, and there continues to be an overflow which the public library attempts to meet. It attempts to meet this through dedication, despite the inadequacy, and even as I have suggested, the inappropriateness of its providing service to this group.

A continuing problem of equal seriousness, however, is the problem of hours and schedules in school library service. As long as a school library closes when the school does, a public library is going to get the school age user after school hours, in the late afternoon, in the evening, on weekends, on holidays, during vacation periods. As long as it gets the school user, it is going to be worried about providing better service to that school age user when he has no library that he can use and, therefore, it seems to me critical that school libraries extend their hours and schedules if they wish to exercise their primary responsibility. I shudder at the recollection of the school librarian who at one time argued with me on this and said that they did not wish to extend the hours of school libraries. How otherwise could they steal our public librarians for more attractive hours?

Inherent in this problem of hours and schedules, and perhaps going beyond it, is an additional problem of the remote residence of students from the school with which they are affiliated. The rural school, the centralized school with its transportation problems may, even if it stayed open after school hours, not be able to meet the needs of the school students. In an urban situation such as New York City, very frequently there are extensive problems of public transportation to a student who lives in a different part of the city from the school where he goes. It is natural if he is not at the school, it would not matter whether the school library was open or not, he is going to use his nearest library, and remember, he has as much right to call that public branch his library as he does to call the school library his library. So it seems to me that we have some adherent problems that are going to continue for quite awhile and it is important for school librarians to understand the conscience of the public librarian in seeking to serve the needs of the school age user always assuming that the school library is not able at the time to meet those needs. So we have a philosophy, we have a problem. And now a brief reference to a plan.

The plan of The New York Public Library for service to the school age groups could be described as informal, evolving, consultative, and dedicated to harmonious parallel operations. I call your attention to the fact that the title of this conference is not a conference on school/public library cooperation, but a conference on school/public library relations and I suggest that in a competitive world, cooperation is often suspect, coordination and consolidation are an antipathetic. Where cooperation, coordination, and consolidation are undesirable or unachievable, I suggest that we at least settle for consultation and for harmonious parallel operations, to which The New York Public Library is best dedicated. I suggest also that we be bound together, if necessary, rather than held apart by the very redtape which has been mentioned already. I cannot see redtape as a devisive material. I think that we may find ourselves properly bound together by it.

Furthermore, I suggest that a library authority as opposed to an overall educational authority, which may have considerable long range merit, is conceivable only by a public librarian. This is because public libraries have a relatively free organizational status, responsible to the body politic as a whole, rather than to a specific institution. School libraries and college libraries are quite properly integrated in their institution - how else can they reflect the specific instructional purposes of that institution? They are an ancillary part of a parent education institution and are not free to consolidate with the public library. And the creation of a library authority - and this is my personal opinion - at any level, local or State, would destroy the value of the library affiliated with an institution, separating it from the very institution which gives it its lifeblood.

Cooperation, therefore, requires common concerns, and can only be partial between school libraries and public libraries because only some of their concerns are common, and I certainly favor cooperation in those areas. A large public library system such as The New York Public Library is therefore going to be concerned with these harmonious parallel relations, with referral from the school librarian to the public librarian when this is appropriate in the opinion of the school librarian; with providing a residual responsibility when the school library is not able to meet the needs, and attracting the attention of the school age group as any other member of the body politic eligible to use the public library, attracting the attention of that user when it has something to offer him in his unaffiliated capacities. We will thus be establishing and operating on a continuing basis branch libraries which meet the necessary needs not met by the school libraries as long, and only as long as they are not met by the school libraries. We will be establishing within the public library regional reference collections to which people can get at hours when school libraries are not open.

We have plans for a Mid-Manhattan library center, which will be geared primarily to serve college level needs of college students and general adults, and which will permit further concentration on the needs of elementary and high school students at the Donnell Library Center, which is established for the primary benefits for those users insofar as their needs cannot be met by the school libraries. We are fortunate, of course, in The New York Public Library having a unique, privately supported research library affiliated with us, whose primary role is to serve the doctoral and postdoctoral research needs of the population. We are delighted that all of these patterns are cooperating in connection with the New York Metropolitan Reference and Regional Library Agency, known as METRO, and I hope that insofar as the reference needs of school libraries are concerned, that cooperation between school libraries and METRO will develop, be possible, and be welcomed. I recognize, however, that only a part of the school library's needs is the concern of METRO - the reference and research part, not the curriculum, instructionally related, educational extension, and audiovisual activities of the school libraries. Therefore, I am suggesting that through a hierarchal system of libraries working together in harmonious parallel operations, that there be simultaneously information transfer in all directions as needed, and responsibility transfer in the direction of affiliation as the institution can expand its services to its proper users. Next to finally I should like to put in a word on behalf of the users, addressed primarily to the librarians. And that is, I suggest that we frame our goals and devise our standards in user terms until, or unless, we reach the perfect world when one single agency can meet all the needs of our users. That we recognize the diversity of libraries which users must at the present time have access to, and frame our goals and devise our standards in those terms.

Finally, a word on behalf of the taxpayers and probably addressed more to the principals and superintendents in the room, especially those who may not yet be convinced of the importance of libraries - I suggest that only quality library service, high quality library service, has any social or educational value. Poor library service is literally unsupportable.

Dr. Richard L. Darling, Director of Instructional Materials, Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland

Cooperation is certainly one of the most frequently used words among librarians today. Surely there has never been a topic about which so much has been said, by so many, and with so little resulting action. We have talked about cooperation, we have been urged to cooperate, and our lawmakers have written cooperation into State and national library legislation. We have had cooperation between school and public libraries, but it has been fitful, rather than continuing, and fraught with misunderstanding. Our professional associations have contributed relatively little to the cause of cooperation between types of libraries. When ALA devoted its recent PEBCO meeting at Bal Harbour to activities of the divisions to promote cooperation among libraries, the reports reflected very little professional association activity to that end.

Reports indicate that library users, when regulations and redtape do not prevent them, create their own systems of libraries. We are well aware that our high school students, at least those who are highly motivated, do not let the walls between libraries stand in their way. When they fail to find what they need in their school libraries, they turn to the nearest public library. When that fails them, as it frequently does in my suburban community, they turn to the public library of our central city. Not finding adequate materials there, they invade the reading rooms of the university libraries, using materials there, and persuading an older brother or a friend to secure for them what otherwise is unavailable.

This is library cooperation of a sort; clandestine cooperation, even though we know it is going on. Whether or not it represents a kind of cooperation that we would be willing to institutionalize, most of us would prefer not to commit ourselves. In fact, there are those in our profession who give the impression that they wish these persistent seekers of library service would cease and desist so that we could continue thinking in our tidy, traditional compartments.

But the problems created by insistent seekers of information and library materials are not going to go away or be solved without hard thinking and hard decisions. If we are to provide library services of quality to young adults, or to any library users, we are going to need to rethink our relationships, to abandon some of our most treasured prejudices, and to decide some basic issues in ways that may lead all of us to new, but insecure, positions.

There are formidable obstacles to effective cooperation between school and public libraries, some of which are decidedly real, but others of which may be partly the creatures of our fancy. Illusion or reality, we shall not get far if we do not face them. One important obstacle is a failure to recognize the essential difference between school library service and public library service to children and young adults. School librarians have made an energetic effort to define the role of the school library. The Advisory Committee to the Knapp School Libraries Project, in a publication issued in July 1966, presented a statement of the school library's role that has won widespread support.

> "The library is the resource center of the school. It contains all types of instructional materials used in

> intellectual pursuits by teachers and students and the equipment necessary for their use. These materials are organized for easy access; they are provided in sufficient quantity and depth to allow groups of materials to be sent to classrooms or to special resource centers for as long a time as they are needed. The necessary equipment is housed where it is accessible for teachers and students for group and individual use."[1]

An even simpler definition of the function of the school library, and one that makes its role crystal clear, is the following:

> The function of the school library is to support the instructional program of the school, supplying instructional materials and equipment and appropriate related services to students and teachers at all levels wherever and whenever they are needed.[2]

Defining the function of the public library in its services to children and young adults is not my responsibility. Indeed, it would be presumptuous were I to attempt a definition. Yet, if successful improvement of library services to children and young adults is to flow from cooperation, both the school and the public library must have a recognizable home base.

It may be that I have mislabeled this obstacle. Our problem may lie in a failure to define our roles, rather than a failure to recognize that there are differences. On two occasions in recent months when I was a speaker at meetings of public library young adult librarians, appearing to explain the role of the school library administered as a comprehensive materials center, I have been asked, during a question period, to define the role of the public library in serving children and young adults. I do not think it is unfair to suggest that such a definition is the job of the public librarian.

Still another obstacle, perhaps, is the conservatism of children and young adult librarians in accepting nonprint media as a part of the information services of libraries. The concentration of the public library on "good literature" to the exclusion of materials providing information in various forms that young people need, has created a gap between the school library and the public library, that has not been bridged by mutual recrimination and attacks on each other's standards. School librarians, or at least a majority today, see their function as supplying sources of information in whatever form or medium the information is available. The public librarian still too often thinks only in terms of the printed book.

---

[1] Knapp School Libraries Project. *The Knapp School Libraries Project is a Five-Year Demonstration Project*. Chicago: Knapp School Libraries Project, 1966.

[2] Stone, Walter C. & others. *A Library Program for Columbia*. Pittsburgh, 1965. p.29.

A third obstacle, and one which may be as much made up of illusion as of reality, consists of jealousy, or of mistrust, I am not sure which. School librarians believe they detect, and on occasion find solid evidence, that public librarians think of the public library as *the* library. As recently as last month, in a report before ALA's Program Evaluation and Budget Committee, a public librarian referred to the school library as such, but to the public library as the library. A small matter, but one which, unfortunately, looms large in the minds of many school librarians.

More important have been several reports in recent years that have promoted the public library at the expense of the school library. Maryland school librarians still bridle at mention of the 1963 Deiches Fund report entitled *Student and the Pratt Library: Challenge and Opportunity* which analyzed the deficiencies in serving students of both the school and public libraries in Baltimore City and Baltimore County, and then assigned a subsidiary role to the schools in meeting the needs of students. In all fairness, some of Maryland's public librarians were equally incensed when the report, *A Library Program for Columbia*, would have assigned all children's services, and most young adult services to the schools.

On other occasions librarians of one type of library or the other have seen laboriously developed programs to improve library services to young adults damaged by interlibrary rivalry. In Montgomery County, recently, we were forced to reply to a letter from the president of the public library board to the president of our county council complaining that evening high school library service encroached on the service responsibilities of the public library.

However, my task today is not to enumerate all the reasons, historical and psychological, that have prevented school and public libraries from cooperating in providing library services to young adults. There are important areas where we cooperate even now, and more that are desirable. Perhaps, if we can talk more about improving *library services*, and only about cooperation as a means to that end, we can achieve more. All too often we have sounded as though cooperation is the end we are seeking, instead of one aspect of providing good library services.

I would like to mention several examples of cooperation in my own county that have helped improve library services to children and young people. For several years Montgomery County public schools have maintained library services in several of the elementary schools during the summer months. The choice of schools to remain open has been determined, in part, by distance from the nearest public library branch, in order to avoid competing for the public library's natural clientele. On the other hand, with more than 100,000 youngsters turned loose on the community for the summer, this service has saved the public libraries, in certain areas of the community, from a deluge of young readers they were not equipped to handle, and the entire community had more library service than was possible had the school collections been locked up for 2 months.

At the same time, the county schools operate an extensive summer instructional program, with more than 20,000 children and young people enrolled for a 6-week summer session. The summer school centers have the same level of library service as regular school year centers. So that the secondary schools offering a summer school program can also serve as community library centers for children who live within walking distance, the public library lends large collections of children's books to these secondary schools, that they may serve children who live within walking distance.

The school and public libraries in our county have had a long and continuing cooperation in serving the needs of the blind. The school system, which owns fairly large collections of braille books and large type books, has made them available to the public library center for service to the blind. The school librarians and public librarians have also held joint meetings related to improving library service to the blind.

I mentioned earlier, and unhappily, a recent unfortunate development concerning our evening high school library service. In earlier, happier times, when the evening program was beginning, the location of the evening centers was determined only after consultation with the public library. Some centers were established in schools located long distances from a public library branch. Others were located, deliberately, where the crush of students in the public library had created a need for relief.

Most recently the public libraries and the schools cooperated in the production of a pamphlet intended to serve students as a guide to the resources of both types of libraries. Designed and published by the Publications Division of the school system, jointly financed, and distributed through public libraries and secondary school libraries, this project brought to every secondary student in the county an outline of available library services and guidance in how he could secure them.

All of the cooperative projects I have mentioned have contributed to a greater or smaller degree to improved library services for those in school. These have been small projects, uncoordinated with one another. There are great holes, not only in our cooperation, but also in our library services to young people. There are challenging areas in which we need to plan together to give better service.

One of these areas is in reference service. Neither the public library nor the school system can currently provide good reference service in depth. Though this may not be true of a major city, it is certainly true in suburban areas that the need to develop neighborhood branches has precluded the establishment of an adequate central library. Both the secondary schools and the public library branches need a backup reference service, complete with teletype connection, and perhaps with facsimile transmission. If we do not plan together to create such a service jointly, we shall both plan separately for two less adequate programs. I am not suggesting that the school system give the public library a grant so that they can develop a bigger and better central library. Instead, I am proposing that a shared center be developed, staffed by both school and public librarians, with a common collection to meet the needs of two types of libraries.

Still another area in which school and public libraries could profitably cooperate, is in the development of review and examination centers. In larger communities both school systems and public library systems are developing such centers, often with duplicate and expensive collections. Joint examination centers could be better staffed and administered, duplication of materials could be reduced, and both school and public librarians would have an opportunity for better knowledge of the materials selected for each type of library.

These two examples do not exhaust the possibilities for cooperative activities geared to better library services. There are other areas of service that could be improved through cooperation. It seems to me, however, that there are some rules of the cooperation game that we shall all have to learn and observe. In terms of services to young adults, the following rules seem to me to be crucial.

1. Both school and public libraries must clearly define their own role in serving young adults.

2. Both school and public libraries must enter into cooperative activities as equals.

3. Any cooperative activity must have as its goal a real improvement in library services to young people. There is no virtue in cooperation if the only result is that librarians feel self-righteous.

4. Both parties to a cooperative endeavor must stand to gain in improvement of their own program as the fruit of cooperation.

It may well be that cooperation in the best of faith will not be enough to provide all the library services we need. A nonprofit corporation, such as that proposed for the city of Columbia, above both the schools and the public libraries, and supplying services which they cannot provide either separately or cooperatively, may provide a method for achieving better library and information services in some communities. The proposed Columbia Communications Corporation would provide equal representation to the schools, the public library, to the citizens, and to industry, provided they all contributed to the support of the agency.

Probably most communities will have to provide better library services through existing agencies. If they are going to provide first-rate programs, they will have to have first-rate institutions. Only good school libraries and good public libraries can give good library service. Making each superior in its own role may be the first step toward meaningful cooperation.

Dr. Mark B. Scurrah, Coordinator, Title III, ESEA, New York State Education Department

I am speaking now as a layman in the sense that I am not a librarian, although I have great interest in libraries. Let me just say this much about Title III.

Title III, ESEA, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is mainly concerned with one thing: Are there better ways to solve our educational problems - our old educational problems and our more recent educational problems? In the last 2½ years of Title III operation, some $24 million of New York State's allocation has been pumped into some ideas. We have received 450 Title III applications or proposals from public school districts throughout the State. We have funded 136 proposals. About a million and one-half dollars have gone to proposals for innovative ideas that deal with libraries, the public school libraries mainly. This represents about 5 percent of the $24 million amoun Ten major Title III projects deal with libraries, including Yonkers and Rochester.

I cannot say from the standpoint of Title III that there is any specific pattern in cooperation between public libraries and school public libraries. That is not to say that it does not exist. Title III does offer the opportunity. One of the primary requirements in this Title is that there be cooperation and coordination between various community agencies. There is a Title III regional center in your area. If you would like to know who the regional center director is and his address, our office can provide you with that information, if you will contact Mr. Barron or myself at the State Education Department.

I have already heard some very good ideas from the previous speakers that could constitute very viable Title III projects that would involve public and school libraries. I am going to suggest to you some ideas that might be useful to you. They are not necessarily Title III ideas because much of this can be done without extra cost. Then I am going to "swing way out" and probably cause a little irritation, and perhaps some humor, for that matter, on other possibilities.

1. It would seem to me that there ought to be some kind of representation from the public schools for example, preferably the chief school administrator or the superintendent on your boards of trustees.

2. Public librarians ought to be participating with school librarians, teachers, and administrators on curriculum committees that are ongoing in our school systems.

3. Public librarians ought to have in their libraries the programs or curricula, the syllabi, and also for that matter, our State guidelines and State syllabi.

4. There ought to be regular joint meetings of the school and public library staff.

5. That there be joint lists of materials held by both libraries, indicating the location of each item, and that school librarians lend materials to the public library during the summer or during vacation time if the school library is not open. Unfortunately in the 171

elementary summer school programs that I knew about in 1964, very few of these schools opened up their elementary libraries.

6. That both public and school library staff should be alerted to the major school assignments. All these are things that you have heard before, but they do not always take place.

   You must realize now on the educational horizon that mass assignments are on the way out. In other words, you will not have droves of children looking for specific information, let us say 30 children looking for information about Asia. That more and more we are customizing our education, we are having customized programs, individualized programs, and therefore, the assignments hopefully will be individualized.

7. That public school library hours be extended to cover more than school time, possibly including Sundays.

8. That materials pertaining to important curriculum areas be found in both school and public library catalogs. Probably including only the subject card would be sufficient. And, hopefully, the interlibrary loan between school and public libraries would be quite simple.

9. Both school and public libraries should be concerned with the judicious expenditure of public funds already alluded to; and that the acquisition of expensive materials should only be undertaken if such materials are not available in the other library.

Now, those are nice standard, sensible approaches to cooperation. In terms of Title III criteria and the priorities that we now see, these would not be innovative approaches if Federal funds were sought under Title III, ESEA.

I wish public and school librarians would figure out a simpler way for one to take a book out of the library. If you could see yourselves go through the romance of this process! To the layman, it appears quite ridiculous. Is it really necessary to separate all the cards, to make a count of your monthly collections, or accumulations, and to file the date due, and go after that person when that book is due? Is there a better way to take out a book?

How can books be used more? Why not have books and magazines in the teachers' room, the principal's office, and the waiting room? Why do all books have to be housed on the shelves in the library? Where do we spend our leisure time? Get your books where it is easy to get hold of them: at the country club, at the golf course, bowling alley?

Another thing - I wonder if we do not spend a lot of time as librarians in just trying to look for things, and teaching kids how to look for things. Maybe time might be spent better in how to use what we find. This is to me more important than the searching process. The searching process, 50 years from now, will not exist. There will be better ways to get the materials, to get the information. The entire library program will be considerably different 25 years from now if we but flex our minds to the constant change demanded of us by technological advances.

REACTION TO DISCUSSION

Reaction to the panel of Geddes, Darling, Cory, and Scurrah produced these points:

1. Concern over the organizational structure that is needed to develop coordinated library service, with discussion focusing on Mr. Geddes' suggestion (point 2) to create a Department of Libraries at the Commissioner's level. It was pointed out that there is now one Commissioner of Education who is ultimately responsible for the supervision of the two units which provide the library development programs for New York State. Mr. Geddes, in return, felt that it would be difficult to achieve coordination or cooperation without one library head at the State level, but this did not necessarily imply consolidation of the library agencies at the local level. There would still be types of libraries serving different communities, and different aspects of the population such as school, college, and public, but within that framework there can be a coordinating agency which provides for intensive coordination and cooperation.

2. Differences in the sources of funds and the taxation bases in the organization and operation of school and public libraries do present problems, but they are not insurmountable ones. It was suggested that we not think of ways of getting money, but consider the program. If the program is good enough, we should be able to convince the people of the need to find the money necessary to implement the program.

Brother Emmet Corry introduced a resolution in this period which appears in the appendix.

THE COMMISSIONER'S COMMITTEE: PERSPECTIVE ON SERVICE TO STUDENTS

Harold S. Hacker, Director, Rochester Public Library and Monroe County Library System

First of all, I would like to add a postscript to Dr. Scurrah's earlier remarks. He talked about the need for taking library materials to where the people are and, among the other places, he mentioned country clubs. Last summer I played in a golf tournament of the trustees of St. John Fisher and Nazareth College and being the only member of the group who was not a member of the country club, I was given an arbitrary handicap which turned out to be high enough that I finally won the trophy. It has since been named the Hacker's Trophy - rather appropriately. During the course of our match there were 12 of us in the tournament. At one time, on about the 14th tee, the course was so crowded that all 12 of us were on the same tee, waiting to tee off. I took that opportunity to open my golf bag and to pull out several books on how to play golf, which I tried to peddle. It did not work, but it does not mean that it might not work some other time.

You are all going to be very fortunate people today, because I know you are probably saying to yourselves: "Holy smoke, not another long talk now." I want to report that the notes for my talk are in a station wagon at the airport in Rochester. I opened my bag on the plane to review them again and found that I did not have them. So, after listening to the discussion this morning, I decided that I should limit myself to setting the stage for the Commissioner's Committee. Then, maybe the best thing that I can do for you is to shut up, and give you a chance to comment or ask questions.

As Bob has indicated, Commissioner Allen did appoint a Commissioner's Committee on Library Development. He appointed the committee last March and gave the committee two assignments - one of which was to recommend to him next steps for State action with respect to the findings in the report, *Emerging Library Systems*, resulting from the department's analysis of the use of public libraries, in which it was pointed out that the public libraries experienced about 50 percent or more student use. There were a number of recommendations in *Emerging Library Systems* relating to public and school library cooperation, coordination, and what have you. So, for this reason, the committee has been called the Committee on Library Development - not just on public libraries or just on reference and research libraries. We are endeavoring to the best of our ability to look at the total picture in the light of what we know now, and what we can learn later.

The members of the committee are 12 - some of whom are here: Dr. Frances Henne, whom you heard yesterday; Dr. Richard Logsdon, Director of Columbia University Libraries,is not here. Giles Shepherd, Associate Director of Cornell University Libraries, is not here. Anthony Cerrato, trustee of METRO and former trustee of the Yonkers Public Library and the Westchester Library System, is not here. Joseph Eisner, Chairman of the NYLA Legislative Committee and Director of the Plainview Public Library, is here. Mrs. Dinah Lindauer, Coordinator of Programs and Services for the Nassau County Library System, is here. John Mackenzie Cory, whom you heard this morning, is Vice Chairman of the committee. Laurence G. Hill, newly appointed Director of the Westchester Library System and former Director of the Nioga Library System, is here. Joseph B. Desmond, Director of Libraries at Cornell Aeronautical Libraries in Erie County, is not with us. Josiah Newcomb, Director of the State University Library at Binghamton, is not with us. Helen F. Rice, Coordinator of School Libraries and Curriculum in the West Irondequoit School System in Monroe County, is not able to be with us. She had hoped to be here today. We are assisted by four staff people, three from the State Education Department. John Humphry, whom I know you have all met, is Assistant Commissioner for Libraries. Jean Connor is Director of the Division of Library Development. Frank Stevens, Chief, Bureau of School Libraries, had to be away in Washington today. Finally, we have as consultant to the committee the former State Librarian and Assistant Commissioner for Libraries, Sam Prentiss.

So far, we have met for 12 days in our deliberations. We are trying to come to grips with the many problems that you have discussed yesterday and today. In the last four meetings, we have been trying to forge a philosophy - a common philosophy -if indeed such is possible. The philosophy, or frame of reference, will emphasize first of all the need of library users regardless of who they may be, or what library they may use. Secondly, we are considering what the roles of the types of libraries should be in meeting these needs. We will have to reach a reasonable degree of agreement if we are going to come up with any sound recommendations to make to the Commissioner. We did have a June 2, 1967 goal set by the Commissioner for short-range recommendations to him that needed legislative implementation or budgetary provisions for the 1968 legislative session or for the State's 1968-69 budget year. And we did meet our deadline; we filed a series of recommendations with the Commissioner. These were in areas that we felt were not controversial, that did not require a great deal of additional information on the part of the committee members, that did not require hearings in the field, or solicitation of viewpoints of various interested bodies. We had no option. We had to either waive any action for an entire year, or meet the deadline. And I am happy to say that we met it.

The recommendations that we made to the Commissioner, with a couple of exceptions, were adopted by the Board of Regents either as part of their Legislative Program for Libraries for 1968, or were incorporated in the Education Department's budget request for 1968-69.

The one recommendation that we made that would cut across lines of libraries and would make possible the use of State funds to help school libraries, college libraries, and public libraries work together to meet needs of the people they are trying to serve is a new program, called the Interlibrary Development Project Fund. This fund will require separate special legislation which will be introduced in the 1968 session of the State Legislature. This program would provide funds on the basis of specific proposals, similar to methods now employed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III, and the Library Services and Construction Act, Titles I and III. Thus, there would be a sum of money available to the Education Department to be administered by the Commissioner; in order for a project to be approved for funding, at least two types of libraries must join together in the planning for purposes of demonstrating to the rest of the State that libraries, by working together and crossing lines, might better serve the needs of the people.

Of course, with all the talk this year about the Governor's budget and the tax issue, there is a question whether this program will be implemented by the Legislature this year. But it is the one area where those of you who believe that there are opportunities for cooperation among school and public libraries, or school and college libraries, or college and public libraries, may work together on specific projects. If this bill does pass and funds are made available, we will have a chance to try something in our State that will be truly significant.

Concerning the relationships between school and public libraries, with which we are concerned these 2 days, the committee members have instructed me to speak for them on several occasions to date to make clear a couple of points. The first point is that the committee is not the author of *Emerging Library Systems*. We want to make it clear that we are not the author because many people, I have learned, think that it is the committee that prepared the report. Our job is to study the report and, in particular, to examine the recommendations and the rationale for them, and then to advise the Commissioner on what the next steps might be.

Then, as far as school-public library relationships are concerned, we have adopted several resolutions - one of which states that we should undertake, as part of our mission, the development of recommendations relating to the establishment of regional library services to elementary and secondary schools. In other words, if the committee members, in our judgment, find that, for example, library programs begun under ESEA Title III (discussed by Dr. Scurrah this morning) have real merit for continuous funding, we might well recommend to the Commissioner that funds be provided by the State for this purpose if Federal funds are eliminated. I say this might be done. It has not been done, but we are interested in the regional aspects of school library service, as I know so many of you are too. Secondly, we voted that we should study and explore possible areas of cooperation and the desirable relations among school, public, and other libraries.

Finally, we want all of you to know that we are soliciting your comments and opinions regarding any phase of our study where you think that your opinion would help us reach a sound judgment. We will welcome your opinions individually. We welcome the opportunity of receiving opinions from organized groups, as we have indeed been doing, and we welcome the opportunity to be invited to meet with organized groups. We do not propose to tell you what we think are the answers, but rather to listen to you and to learn what you think are the answers to some of the problems that we are studying.

There is one committee action to date that I think is of paramount interest to school librarians. The committee, in its short-range report to the Commissioner last May, recommended that the Education Department undertake a comprehensive study of school libraries in the State. This recommendation has not yet been implemented. Dr. Henne is the one-woman subcommittee of our committee who will be reporting later this month on the detailed reasons for such a study. It is our intention to do all that we can to persuade the Commissioner and the Associate and Assistant Commissioners involved that this study is long overdue in our State, and that the Department should make a comprehensive study of school libraries, similar to those made on two occasions for public libraries in our State.

At this time, as I conclude my remarks, we profess to have no answers to the questions you raised this morning. As a matter of fact, in most cases we have not yet addressed ourselves to seeking answers to those questions. For, like yourselves, I think, I hope, that it is incumbent upon us to learn, from as many different viewpoints as possible, all that we must learn before we make judgments, and advise the Commissioner. For this reason, we welcome the opportunity, as I said earlier, of receiving views from the field and of going into the field to meet with groups of librarians of every type and of library trustees, too, to get considered judgments of people who have given serious thought to *Emerging Library Systems*.

One of the problems about *Emerging Library Systems* that has caused so much stir in our State, is the fact that, because of timetables within the Education Department, there just have not been enough copies available to permit all interested persons to read it in its entirety. I am happy to say that the printed version of the report now has come off the press. It will be available in a quantity of about 7,000. The previous multilithed version was available in a quantity of only 1,000 and only a few remained. At the NYLA conference in Rochester, people could sign up for copies so that at least a lot more people have read it since October than were able to do so before that time. We hope that all of you read it carefully and give it your thoughtful consideration, just as we are doing for the third time now. I do not think that there is anything more that I care to add at this point, but I would welcome some questions or comments from the floor. I thank you for the opportunity of being able to speak to you about our efforts to date. I would like to say that you are indeed lucky because, if I had brought my notes, I would have been much more long-winded.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION PERIOD

Discussion of Mr. Hacker's report on the progress that has been made by the Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Library Development centered on these points:

1. The way the committee solicits aid and information to help its members make their recommendations;

2. The nature and role of the committee;

3. The extent of utilizing existing school studies in formulating long-range recommendations.

With copies of the report, *Emerging Library Systems*, prepared by the Division of Evaluation of the State Education Department, now available, the committee continues the request made in October at the New York Library Association meeting for all librarians, administrators, and trustees to read the report and send any comments or suggestions on whatever area of library service they care to make to Mr. Hacker or to any member of the committee. The committee has addressed many group meetings and will continue to do so as far as it is possible. The charge to the committee by Commissioner Allen was to make recommendations to the Department for the next steps for the library program in New York State. Particular attention was to be focused on the findings and recommendations in the report *Emerging Library Systems* and also to study the status and needs of the emerging reference and research library program. The committee is an advisory body and not a legislative one.

The committee has discussed some of the school studies which are available, but they do not have the benefit of an overall comprehensive school library study. The committee has recommended that the State Education Department undertake such a study of school library service in New York State.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FUND: IDEAS FOR JOINT PLANNING

Helen R. Sattley, Director of the Bureau of School Libraries, City of New York Board of Education

I am going to talk about a student reference center that was developed by the public and school libraries of New York City for Title II and III of ESEA.

The very first fall that ESEA was in effect, at a meeting of Dr. Donovan's (the Superintendent of Schools, New York City) Advisory Committee for Title III, one of the problems brought up was the student use of libraries. I think Mr. Byam was sitting in that day on the Advisory Committee for Mr. Humphry, who was at that time Director of the Brooklyn Public Library. Dr. Donovan asked me if I would head up a subcommittee of his Title III Advisory Committee, and work with the public libraries and the university libraries of the city to see what could be done.

The subcommittee then formed consisted of the Director of School Library Service, New York City Board of Education, Chairman; the Director of Audiovisual Instruction of the Board of Education; the directors of the three public library systems of the city; the Director of Libraries of City College, representing the city colleges; the Director of Libraries, Columbia University, representing other institutions of higher education; and, later, representatives of nonpublic schools of the city.

I would like to read to you now some parts of the report of the project proposal which we developed to show you how we came to decide what we decided upon. My emphasis this afternoon is not so much the what, but the how. So I am emphasizing how we worked together and planned, bringing the what afterwards.

Someplace along the way, and I think it was even in Dr. Donovan's original committee, we decided that what we needed were student reference centers. Dr. Donovan had said maybe we could have one, eventually, in every district of the city (that means 30 districts at the present time), but that we should start out with one in a borough, as a demonstration center. In planning for the first five centers, the subcommittee proposed that different methods of administration be tried: public library administration for a center in a public library, board of education administration for a center in a public school, and cooperative or independent administration in rented or separate quarters. However, by the terms of Title III, ESEA, only one such center could be financed at a time, and this with little or no construction or reconversion costs. (If we had had those kinds of costs, we would have had to commit the city for 20 years of financing this project - that is what is in the Title III, ESEA, Federal law.) Therefore, by the terms of Title III, the subcommittee narrowed its selection to the type of administration which might be most easily developed, in the shortest possible time, and would yield the largest floor space available.

It was quite obvious that this would be an underutilized public library branch. Accordingly, the three public libraries of the city were asked to decide among themselves which public library having such a branch would assume the responsibility. The Brooklyn Public Library was selected. Several circumstances were involved in this selection. In the first place, the library was very interested in experimenting with such a center, since it is used by both college and high school students to an extent which is beyond that which it can now adequately manage. Second, it had available the Pacific Branch, which was greatly underutilized, so that most of its 7,400 sq. ft. could be turned over to such a student reference center.

Bookstacks, floor space, and public restrooms were among the facilities already available for use. The branch could be made over into such a center with very little cost, in comparison to the initial plan offering. Furthermore, this branch library was ideally located in one of the business sections of the city and could be reached by many forms of transportation. Moreover, The New York Public Library and the Queens Borough Public Library are developing, or have new centers which feature services to students. The New York Public Library will soon open a new reference center for students in the Arnold Constable Building.

In a citywide survey performed by Nelson Associates in 1960, on which the Arnold Constable library location was based, Brooklyn was shown to have the greatest number of resident students of high school and college ages. It was also shown that many of them use the facilities of The New York Public Library, as do students in all boroughs, because of its central location and more extensive books and reference collections. These are the reasons the Pacific Branch was chosen by the public libraries and eventually by the subcommittee.

This branch is located in Brooklyn, in one of the business areas as it has been said, within the area of two public school districts. There are in that area 500,000 people, 6.4 percent of the total New York City population, and 3 percent of the total State population. The area has in it the Brooklyn Museum, the main building of the Brooklyn Public Library, Botanic Gardens, Prospect Park, and the Academy of Music. It is a community which is integrated to a large percent, but there are sections which are white upper class or upper middle or middle class economic background. However, for the most part the area is mainly a low and middle socioeconomic area. It has Norwegians and Negroes, Italians and Swedish, Irish and Jewish, and Puerto Ricans within it, groups which represent a cross section, really, of New York City. There are 8 public libraries within that area, 4 public high schools, and 11 nonpublic high schools representing Catholic and Jewish schools and a Friends' school. In these schools involved there are 12,400 students in the public schools and 7,600 in the nonpublic schools. The costs for the center over a 2-year period, including operating costs, came to $656,000, $306,000 of which we were asking from Title III in 2-year allowances. We had been granted $250,000 to come from Special Purpose grants of ESEA, Title II at the State level, and $100,000 was to be made up of New York City basic grant money from Title II over a 2-year period.

This project proposed to bring into existence a service to students that had been advocated in one way or another by the public and school library fields for many years. Student use of public libraries has been a major emphasis in library discussions and research the last decade. As the curriculum has turned from emphasis upon the single textbook to the use of many books and as the student population has continued to expand (and we did not say, but we certainly should have added, as a result of the excellent school and public library service we have been giving over the years that are now showing results too), student demand upon the public library has increased beyond the facilities of these libraries. In New York City, the problem is further complicated by the fact that many high school students live in another part of the city from where they go to school.

Libraries have been concerned with college students as well as high school students in their studies and discussions. While the proposed center is designed especially for high school students, close attention was to be paid to the use college students made of it so that recommendations for future centers would contain provision for service to college students if this service seemed warranted by this first center's use. There is a complication here. The college people agreed that we should start with the high school age level people and watch to see how the center was used. Frank Stevens was a bit concerned that college students might come to use materials, and Federal regulations for Title II limit use of these materials to students up through high school. Again we are tied with regulations which sometimes are not realistic and even seem silly in light of the greater needs of a specific problem.

The purpose for establishing a student reference center is many-sided. First, we hope to meet the immediate needs of high school boys and girls for reference and reading materials in one area of the city, with attractive and functional facilities, especially in the hours their school libraries are not open. Second, to develop a pilot or demonstration reference center in which the problems involved and the implications for the development of such student reference centers throughout the city may be studied. Third, to seek a solution in one area of the city to a local problem which has national implications, as similar situations develop throughout the country for very much the same purposes. Fourth, to set patterns and to explore the possibilities of cooperative planning for the reference, research, and reading needs of high school students by public and nonpublic school agencies, public libraries, and the city and private colleges in the city.

We proposed to have the branch keep on serving its adult public, which now takes up about 10 percent of the facilities, and we were to use the rest of the building. We were to have the second and third floors and part of the first, where the public facilities are. The center was to be open after school hours. We hoped that it could be opened from early afternoon until 9 or 10 o'clock at night, all day on Saturday until 9 or 10, and all day Sunday until 6 o'clock. We understand that sometimes there are between 2,000 and 3,000 people waiting to get in at Grand Army Plaza (the main building), just a few blocks away, when it opens at 2 o'clock in the afternoon on Sunday, and many of these are students who have standing room only in parts of the library. We hoped to be able to drain that pressure off.

We hoped to have the most modern of AV materials and equipment. Dr. Bernard (Bureau of Audiovisual Instruction in the Board of Education) was going to work very closely with the Brooklyn Public Library people in developing plans and programs. There was to be a graphics person on board at all times so that students could have many projects worked out for them, if they wanted this kind of service. There were to be listening tables and all kinds of reference material and reading material, but until we learned what the demand would be, we were saying this was to be a reference center. We kept circulation of materials as a goal if it was possible, but until we saw how materials were to be used, we would concentrate on reference services.

The Brooklyn Public Library had already sets of library periodicals which it would turn over to the library for use. We hoped to have a staff on hand at all times, a moonlighting staff of both school people and public library people, after school hours, to be divided equally between the public library and the school library personnel, with one full-time public library director in charge. The program was to be administered by the Brooklyn Public Library, in subcontract to the Board of Education. We would have an AV person from the board after school, working on projects for young people if they needed such help.

This is just a rough sketch of what we had hoped to do. I think it is terribly important to realize - and I did not realize it until I was thinking about this again for this meeting - that there was not any question as we went along of any fear of loss of identity by librarians, city or college librarians or school librarians in the group. We were working together for the students of the city, and there was no question that we were all wanting the same things and devising some kind of plan that would get us where we wanted to go, and I have been thinking in connection with this program today, what the difference is. I think the difference is that in a program like this there is no fear that one group is going to take anything away from another. I know from experience that many of us school librarians have had this fear and the public librarians also have had it over the years, and when there is fear that somebody is going to take over what we feel very strongly and professionally is our responsibility, then we can fight. I can sometimes fight like a mother cat when something I feel I should be responsible for is threatened. But in a situation like this, the emphasis is not on what I am going to lose and what somebody else is going to gain - it is what we are doing for children. I think that the important thing for a program like this is for all of us to realize that we can have cooperation of different groups of people, with different kinds of administration, working together without having to come under one umbrella. The purpose of our services can be cooperation, and we are not going to have friction if we work for the services and not for what our own group is going to gain or lose from it.

I still hope there is a possibility of a project like this. It was an exciting thing to work on and it has great potential not only for this city but for the kinds of programs that are needed throughout the country.

Laurence G. Hill, Director, Westchester Library System

These remarks are addressed to the here and now: libraries as they are, not as they may be 5 or 10 years hence. Neither the public library nor the school library alone by itself can meet the total library needs of the young person in secondary school. I feel also that any public librarian or school librarian who thinks his library can meet all these needs is overestimating his library or underestimating the needs of young adults.

As a matter of practical fact neither type of library, except in relatively rare instances, comes near meeting all of the standards currently adopted by school or public librarians. One major objective of library service is to provide maximum exposure of available materials to the potential user. This means exposure when materials are most needed and at the most convenient place and time for that person to use them.

Attention should be given here to Emerson Greenaway's comment of yesterday and Dr. Darling's remarks that we cannot actually tell when and where a student will attack his assignment.

Let us assume that useful materials on school motivated needs are available in a variety of types of libraries within an area. Then there should be machinery to gather them and move a concentration of these materials from the several types of libraries to the physical locations, to which our student clientele will have access when they can, or wish to attack their problems. We know enough about hours of schoolday, weekends, and locations of libraries in relation to homes of students and vacations, so that we can get the materials to suitable locations. Also, students are not shy, they will tell us what they "have to have." Also, teacher-librarian communication on forthcoming assignments is improving in schools and public libraries. The specific suggestion I have is not new and I think better adapted to suburban and rural areas than to strictly urban centers.

I suggest a project which is essentially a clearinghouse for requests from cooperating libraries for supplementary materials to meet immediate short-term demands from student clientele. If you will, a decentralized pool collection available to all participating libraries.

In order to insure wide participation and points of access for the clientele, public and school libraries at least must join. Other libraries that could participate are private schools, community colleges, and possibly small 4-year colleges.

I mean to use the collections of the participating libraries as the pool by establishing a clearinghouse to handle the libraries' requests for deposits of supplementary materials.

Service areas might be one or more BOCES areas, a public library system, or possibly a group of school districts and the public, community colleges, and other libraries enclosed in the area. In any case, membership and service should be offered to all types of libraries in the area. The sponsoring agency can be whichever combination of the above types of library that is willing to take a crack at it.

Objectives can be as many as seem feasible. The following are a few: free loan of materials should be available without regard for ownership from all types of libraries to all other types of libraries; loans from public libraries to schools and schools to public libraries; public to private school and vice versa; concentration in public libraries and other centrally located libraries during weekends and vacations, and concentration in school and/or college libraries during school days; adjustment of open hours in all libraries to accommodate clientele; loan of microreading equipment, projectors, and audiovisual equipment. The means to accomplish the objectives are: flexible delivery systems; use of bookmobiles or mobile AV equipment; direct telephone or teletype connections with participating libraries; union catalogs; printouts from automated processing centers; curricula bibliographies; local subject bibliographies;and other holdings information available.

The staff would depend on the size of the area, but I believe a dependence on good clericals and paraprofessionals would cut down on the need for heavy commitment in professional staff. There should be broad public and school library experience throughout the staff, both clerical and professional. If requests are prepared by librarians, there will be hopefully less bibliographic work needed at the clearinghouse. Some form of compensation to those libraries which bear the greater load will be necessary.

None of the above ideas are new. What is required is a sense of library service and a willingness to cross jurisdictional lines with a real concern for the end result rather than the means.

The idea is to put the reader and learning material in as frequent juxtaposition as possible in a situation where interaction will take place. This can be the school library, the public library or in the home itself.

Mrs. Dinah Lindauer, Coordinator, Programs and Services, Nassau Library System

All of us have been doubly troubled. First, by how far short we fall of meeting the library needs of students. Second, by the possibility that in meeting short-term objectives we may be defeating our future long-term objectives. Trouble of this sort, John W. Gardner characterized as "good troubles." How can troubles be good? In a TV interview last Sunday night, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare differentiated between bad troubles and good troubles in this way:

> Bad troubles are what you have when there is a general failure or refusal to recognize that problems exist - with a resulting stagnation and withering away of institutions that are failing to meet needs.

On the other hand, good troubles may be more painful because there is an awareness of the problems and a resulting conflict of views on how best to resolve them. Mr. Gardner suggests that the times then call for leadership to orchestrate these conflicting views into a workable operational strategy.

If I may switch metaphors and move from music to medicine, we cannot come up with a cure until we go through a period of diagnosis and healing. We have had several studies in various parts of the country which contribute data for our diagnoses. The Deiches Study in Baltimore, the reports arising out of the Knapp demonstration schools, the growing body of information from exemplary projects funded through ESEA and LSCA, and in our own State, the questions raised in the *Emerging Library Systems* report can be helpful. For diagnostic purposes, our data is sketchy and inconclusive and tells us more about what we do not know than what we do. Yet, lest our patient die while we are holding consultations, we need to treat symptoms and start a healing process. Hippocrates says, "Healing is a matter of time, but it is also sometimes a matter of opportunity. However, knowing this, one must attend in practice not primarily to plausible theories, but to experience combined with reason."

The proposed Inter-Library Cooperative Development Project Fund can provide the opportunity to speed the remedial process even while we are engaged in diagnosis. Indeed, it can be a constructive part of diagnosis if projects are developed as a means of testing our "plausible theories." Hippocrates adds, "Conclusions which are merely verbal cannot bear fruit, only those which are based on demonstrated fact." The Project Fund could provide that opportunity to demonstrate.

There is an overwhelming temptation to use the Project Fund to deal first with those symptoms which are most obvious - such as projects for sharing of reference materials. I prefer to reject such projects for the moment because from my own point of view, as far as materials are concerned, the patient is starved rather than sick. Local school library agencies have suffered from malnutrition for so long that many could say what they need more than the "pep pills" of cooperative projects is a realistic annual diet of materials and personnel. This is certainly an obvious prerequisite to determining what additional advantages there might be in interagency cooperative planning at various levels. Therefore, I would like to pose for your consideration a project which may appear to be of low priority, since it does not directly benefit students. The project would involve services to librarians working with students, rather than to the students themselves. The two areas are programs in support of the selection process, such as examination or evaluation facilities, and programs in support of utilization of materials, such as in service training and continuing education opportunities.

Mr. Gardner made another comment that is relevant here. He said that one of the by-products of our age of expanding technology is the increasing number of choices available to each individual. He was talking about the enlarged horizons made possible by television and other sophisticated media of communication. He might also have been talking about the choices available to the professional whose task it is to collect, design, organize, and disseminate the materials which support the educational process.

In Nassau County we have approximately 300 librarians who work directly with secondary school students in our school and public libraries. Also within the county borders, we have a graduate library school in which 600 full- and part-time library students are enrolled. A conservative estimate of the book funds expended for printed library materials for the secondary school age group is well in excess of $1 million a year.

There has been no general study in Nassau County of the methods and sources used for selecting the materials which this $1 million book fund buys. About 1,000 book titles are involved each year in the book evaluation program of the Young Adult Services Consultant at the Nassau Library System. Books are displayed monthly with critical reviews and are available for examination by public and school librarians. Although a small number of school librarians share the task of evaluating the titles, this service is not a true example of a cooperative program. The display and review program is focused primarily on serving the needs of librarians who work with teenagers in the public libraries of the county.

I would like to use this example to make an important distinction between two types of cooperative programs. The first type I think of as "courtesy cooperation." When librarians from one kind of library agency are invited to use a service or facility that was originally designed to meet the specific needs of another library agency, you have what I call courtesy cooperation.

There are many examples of this useful arrangement throughout the State. But this courtesy arrangement should not be confused with planned cooperation. This starts with representatives from two types of agencies sitting down together and planning a service that is designed to meet the objectives of both. The Title III student reference center proposal described by Helen Sattley is an example of this kind of cooperation. I do not wish to belittle the value of "courtesy cooperation." I merely point out that it may result in residual needs unmet for one of the participants.

I have digressed from the subject of selection of materials and I would like to get back to it now. With the exception of about 1,000 titles in the NLS Young Adult evaluation program and an additional 1,500 titles covered by Children's Services, the bulk of the orders for the remaining annual output of publishers stem from reviews, publishers' announcements, and other printed sources. There are conflicting schools of thought on the need for examination of materials in contrast to reliance on printed reviews as a basis of ordering.

It is generally agreed, however, that whether or not the examination facility is linked to ordering, it can also serve a range of bibliographic and training needs for all the practitioners and library students within the area. The working draft of a new guidebook for young adult services, now in preparation by an ALA committee, details the elements of an extremely comprehensive collection of materials for the use of working and student librarians that should be available within a reasonable distance.

The school library standards in preparation by a committee of AASL will also recommend, I feel sure, a similar comprehensive regional facility for the examination of materials by school librarians. The development of such a facility would be a productive area for a cooperative project serving the needs of all libraries that serve students. Such a project would not inhibit support and growth of the materials collections in either type of library at the local or regional levels. Each agency can use the facility to serve its own goals, without shortchanging the goals of the other. A materials examination center could serve as a research facility for library students and support inservice and continuing education programs suited to the specialized needs of the librarian on the job.

This brings me to a very specific recommendation. I feel there is logic in linking such a facility to a graduate library school in order to include incentives to stimulate use.

Before I develop this last statement any further I would like to pause to consider why I suggest that "incentives" might be necessary in order to stimulate the use of something that I have just characterized as being wanted and useful. The Nassau Library System has just discontinued a 3-year experiment with an Adult Book Approval Service. During this period, nearly 17,000 new titles were displayed for examination at monthly intervals. The books were often available before official publication date. No reviews, either printed or custom-done locally, accompanied the books. The service was dropped because it was used only by 11 to 15 libraries out of a total of 51 public library members of the system. The facility was open to secondary school librarians, but their use was so minimal as to be practically nonexistent. Obviously, this kind of examination facility was not meeting the needs of either public or school librarians. On the other hand, system services that combine workshop or inservice training opportunities with the examination of appropriate materials, are heavily and enthusiastically used.

We have had many useful examples of both courtesy cooperation and planned cooperation on workshops and inservice training in Nassau County. For 2 years in a row, an outstanding afterhours course was held in the East Meadow School District under the State Education Department's LOIS program. The courses were cooperatively planned by the school library coordinator of the district and the services consultants at the system. Last spring more than 130 librarians and teachers from public and private schools and public libraries attended the 10 sessions. One of the problems the participants faced was locating in any one place all the materials referred to in the course.

An annual Spring Storytelling Workshop, planned cooperatively by the NLS Children's Services Consultant and the graduate library school in the county, also attracts wide participation from schools and public libraries. Last spring there were 300 registrants, including about equal numbers of librarians, teachers, and graduate students. Several NLS workshops on Government Documents, Vocational Guidance Materials, Library Displays, Paperbacks, and other specialized areas, which included school librarians among the participants, are successful examples of courtesy cooperation.

I cite these as examples of training opportunities that could be linked to examination centers. The facility could also double as a research center for both library school students and working librarians in the field.

If there is merit to the proposal, there are a variety of funds that could get it started. A combination of HEA, LSCA, and ESEA funds could cover parts of the budget for such a facility. If the proposed Inter-Library Project Fund becomes law, it could serve as the magnet to draw together the several Federal programs that apply.

I will not attempt to detail for you the mechanics of making such a proposal operational. These should be determined by a governing body that represents the library school and the participating school and public library agencies after they have met and pinpointed their individual objectives. The library school, which trains the professional personnel who enter both types of agencies, could provide the neutral territory to orchestrate the individual objectives into a coordinated and cooperative program.

In conclusion, I must add that my theorizing has not been tested on either the library school, system personnel, or the representatives of the several groups that speak for the school librarians of the county. It is only a "plausible theory," and as such would be characterized by Hippocrates as "deceptive and treacherous." It represents one individual's view of where we might start in one region to plan a cooperative resource serving the partners who share the responsibility for meeting the library needs of the teenagers.

It will take all the support and expertise we can muster to bring public libraries and school libraries up to the levels they must attain to satisfy those young people who are sensitive, serious, and informed critics of their society and its educational system, and to stimulate the others into a new mood of intellectual and cultural concern.

SUMMARY

Jean L. Connor, Director, Division of Library Development

Purpose: Esther Helfand, in her introduction to the conference, stated the purpose of our meeting this way: "to define the direction we need to take in school/public library relations if we are to prepare the way for what library service will be and must be." We were invited to consider, explore, dream, predict.

In my summary, I have endeavored to single out the concerns, to highlight new directions proposed.

In Dr. Henne's talk on national standards for media centers in schools, we were urged to direct our efforts towards achieving media centers in all schools which now lack such centers, and towards improving the quality of the centers which now exist. These standards will call, as I understand it, for a unified program of books and AV, at the school building, district, and regional level. She gave us a glimpse of a world-to-be where all children had school libraries or media centers; where there would be a media specialist with supporting staff for every 250 students; where the material resources would be at a level of adequacy to meet about 99 percent of all school-motivated assignments; where there would be service not only to students but parents and teachers; and where school libraries would have extended hours, including vacations and Saturdays. If there was one phrase which would summarize Dr. Henne's talk, it would be, a concern for adequate and necessary services to students and teachers.

Emerson Greenaway, from his vantage point of a member of the National Commission on Libraries, pointed us in the direction of continued Federal assistance for libraries, but modified and expanded. He saw, in our future, school buildings which were designed to provide access to the library when the building was closed. He pointed, too, towards the need for special help for disadvantaged children. The public library's opportunity for increased service to adults was stressed. As an administrator, concerned with financial planning, he urged joint efforts to find the solutions to the problems of library service to students. If there was one phrase which would summarize Mr. Greenaway's talk, it would be, a concern for comprehensive program and fiscal planning, by both school and public libraries working together.

In the question period, it was clear that the audience was not content to have the issues go by too easily in terms of "more" or "plan." Searching questions brought out the need for costing out plans in relation to the fiscal realities of our cities, the need for definition of function, and the need for additional research and data.

In the second session, the impact of ESEA was brought out by Martin Brech; the potential of a statewide reference and research library program of interlibrary loan was described by E. J. Josey; and Edwin Holmgren gave us background on ANYLTS, the planning going forward for a centralized cataloging center for the public library systems of the State.

This morning, Andy Geddes gave us five propositions which he felt basic to the future:

1. The need for budgeted time for cooperative planning;
2. The need for a unified program at the State level;
3. The need for the State to develop and enforce realistic standards;
4. The need to develop integrated regional service units; and
5. The need for a library information clearinghouse.

If there was one phrase which would summarize Andy Geddes' talk it might be a concern for an integrated structure.

Dr. Darling pointed us towards a future in which jealousy and mistrust might be laid aside; where school and public libraries recognize the differences in their roles and reach an understanding that the goal is not cooperation for itself, but rather the improvement of library services. Towards this end, he asked us to think about the possibilities of 1) a shared backstopping center staffed by both school and public librarians and 2) the development of joint review and examination centers. If I could summarize Dr. Darling's excellent talk in a phrase, it would be a concern for mutual respect and an understanding of our differing roles, so that we could move forward together to better library service.

John Cory directed our attention to the user and the taxpayer. While expressing willingness to yield to the school libraries' school-related service to students, he pointed out the public libraries' residual responsibilities and some of the inherent problems which now exist relating to hours of school library service, transportation, etc. He characterized The New York Public Library's approach as an informal, evolving, consultative relationship dedicated to harmonious parallel operation. He opposed the idea of a single library authority. John Cory did his own summarization and it went like this, "We should frame our goals in user terms."

Mark Scurrah, speaking on behalf of ESEA Title III, asked us, "Are there better ways of solving our educational problems?" He made a number of "within reach" suggestions including longer hours of service, joint lists of materials. Then he went out on a limb and proposed a couple of way-out ideas just to shake us out of being wrapped up in existing processes and procedures. In summary, Mark Scurrah's talk was a plea for creativity and innovation; his was a concern for change.

In the major speeches then we have found these themes:

1. A concern for adequacy (Henne);
2. A concern for comprehensive program and fiscal planning (Greenaway);
3. A concern for an integrated structure (Geddes);
4. A concern for mutual respect and understanding of roles (Darling);
5. A concern for user oriented goals (Cory); and
6. A concern for change (Scurrah).

Applications of some of these concepts were given practical application in the projects proposed this afternoon, projects which might be considered for funding under the proposed Interlibrary Cooperative Development Project Fund.

The three proposals were:

1. Proposal for a joint student reference center, to be operated by the Brooklyn Public Library under contract with the New York City Board of Education. (This was originally planned for funding under ESEA Titles II and III.) - Helen Sattley

2. A clearinghouse for requests for supplementary materials for short-term loan to participating libraries, including a flexible delivery service. - Larry Hill

3. Materials examination facility, linked to inservice training and a graduate library school. - Dinah Lindauer

Their talks might be summarized as a concern for some practical steps in the here and now.

Now, as the meeting draws to a close, there are those of you in the audience who still have convictions you would like to state, points of view you would like to share or projects you would like to propose. The Division of Library Development will be sending you a copy of the proceedings of this conference, but meanwhile, we welcome your expressions of opinion. You know, too, that the Commissioner's Committee on Library Development, chaired by Harold Hacker, will welcome letters from you. If you write us, we will share your comments with the Commissioner's Committee, if you wish.

Now a word of summary of my own. In the current Broadway play, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*, two minor players in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* become the major characters of a drama in which between living through the scenes of *Hamlet*, they debate the meaning of life and their part in it. They wonder about their future. The audience, of course, knowing *Hamlet*, knows how the play will end, but Rosencrantz and Guildenstern do not.

Let us go away from this conference not busy like Rosencrantz and Guildenstern trying to fathom the text of a play which is already written, but instead realizing that no one has yet written our lines or ended our part. We, all of us here, are not just actors, but authors and directors. The future of library service, the future of school/public library relations, is something we ourselves are evolving and shaping. May we shape this future with responsibility, mutual respect, professional dedication, and good humor.

SCHOOL-PUBLIC LIBRARY COOPERATION CONFERENCE

Sheraton Motor Inn, New York City
February 8-9, 1968

REGISTERED PARTICIPANTS

The following participants are from New York State:

AKE, Robert S., Director, Finkelstein Memorial Library, South Madison Avenue and Route 59, Spring Valley 10977

BARRON, Robert E., School-Public Library Liaison, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

BERRY, Mabel, Chairman, Library Department, Central School District #2, Instructional Materials Center, Woodbury School, Syosset 11797

BRECH, Martin, Associate, Bureau of School Libraries, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

*BULL, Dr. Patricia, Center on Innovation in Education and ESEA Title III, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

CARPENTER, Dr. Reigh W., Superintendent, Greater Amsterdam School District, 41 Division Street, Amsterdam 12010

CASHMAN, Helen, Director of Library Services, Genesee Valley School Development Association, 100 Allens Creek Road, Rochester 14618

CHENAULT, Price, Director of Education, New York State Correction Department, Alfred E. Smith State Office Building, Albany 12225

*CLARK, Geraldine, Supervisor of School Library Service, New York City Board of Education, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn 11201

CLARK, Mrs. Joan E., Films and Recordings Consultant, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

COHEN, Abraham J., Supervisor of Instructional Materials and School Libraries, White Plains Public Schools, Education House, 5 Homeside Lane, White Plains 10605

COHN, Emma, Office of Young Adult Work, The New York Public Library, Fifth Avenue and 42d Street, New York 10018

COLE, Doris, President, New York Library Association, School of Library Science, Syracuse University, Syracuse 13210

CONNOR, Jean L., Director, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

CORY, John Mackenzie, Deputy Director, The New York Public Library, Fifth Avenue and 42d Street, New York 10018

CORY, Mrs. Patricia, Director, Library Media Center, Lexington School for the Deaf, 26-26 75th Street, Jackson Heights 11370

CORRY, Brother Emmett, O.S.F., School Library Consultant, Brooklyn Catholic School System, 500 19th Street, Brooklyn 11215

CURRIE, Dorothy, Supervisor of Libraries, Board of Education, 138 South Broadway, Yonkers 10706

CUTCHER, Abraham, Director of Secondary Education, North Tonawanda Public Schools, 236 Goundry Street, North Tonawanda 14120

*CYPHER, Mrs. Priscilla, Head of Secondary Libraries, Byram Hills High School, Tripp Lane, Armonk 10504

DE RUVO, Michael, President, School Libraries Section, New York Library Association, Roslyn Junior High School, Roslyn Heights 11577

DEUTSCH, Herbert, Coordinator of School Libraries and Audiovisual Services, Lindenhurst Public Schools, Lindenhurst 11757

DIDAS, Evelyn, Supervisor of School Libraries, Board of Education, 728 City Hall, Buffalo 14202

DI PRETORE, Hugh, Library Coordinator, Long Beach City Schools, Lido Boulevard, Long Beach 11560

*DONOVAN, Dr. Bernard, Superintendent of Schools, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn 11201

DUTELLE, Thomas E., Director, East Meadow Public Library, Front Street and Newbridge Avenue, East Meadow 11550

EBETINO, Mrs. Shirley, Library Coordinator, Schenectady Public Schools, 108 Union Street, Schenectady 12305

*EISEIDEL, Mrs. Dorothy, Supervisor of Libraries, Whitesboro Public Schools, Whitesboro 13492

EISNER, Joseph, Director, Plainview-Old Bethpage Public Library, 999 Old Country Road, Plainview 11803

EMERLING, Mrs. Florence, Project Director, ESEA Title III, Educational Media Center, Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Chautauqua County, P.O. Box 250, Fredonia 14063

*EMERY, Dr. Donald G., Superintendent, Scarsdale Public School, Brewster Road, Scarsdale 10583

ENEQUIST, Mrs. Jacqueline H., Head, Special Field Services Section, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

FIELDING, Kenneth R., Director, East Rochester Public Library, 901 Main Street, East Rochester 14445

*FLORES, Robert J., Chief, Bureau of Public Library Services, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

FOX, Joseph, Administrative Assistant, Education Department, Diocese of Rockville Centre, 50 North Park Avenue, Rockville Centre 11570

FRANTZ, John C., Director, Brooklyn Public Library, Grand Army Plaza, Ingersoll Building, Brooklyn 11238

*FRENCH, Mrs. Anne, Chairman of Libraries, Ramapo Central School District #2, Spring Valley 10977

GARWOOD, Dr. George, Superintendent, Whitesboro Public Schools, Whitesboro 13492

GEDDES, Andrew, Director, Nassau Library System, Roosevelt Field Shopping Center, Garden City 11530

*GILLARD, William, Professor, Librarian, Saint John's University Libraries, Jamaica 11432

GILLESPIE, John, Associate Professor, Graduate Library School, C. W. Post College, Long Island University, Box 247, Greenvale 11548

GODFREY, Mrs. Jean, Chief, The Branch Libraries, The New York Public Library, Fifth Avenue and 42d Street, New York 10018

GOLDBERG, Mrs. Dorothy, Coordinator, Public Library-School Relations Project, Nioga Library System, 2510 Seneca Avenue, Niagara Falls 14305

GRAF, Mrs. Betty, Library Supervisor, Rochester Public Schools, Rochester 14618

GRANITE, Harvey, City School District, Rochester 14614

GRIECO, D. Marie, School of Library Service, Columbia University, 616 Butler Hall, 535 West 114th Street, New York 10027

HACKER, Harold S., Director, Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester 14604

HARPER, Winifred K., Deputy Director, Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, Lafayette Square, Buffalo 14203

HARRIS, Mrs. Eleanor C., Director, Ramapo Catskill Library System, 619 North Street, Middletown 10940

HARSHE, Florence E., Director, Southern Adirondack Library System, 22 Whitney Place, Saratoga Springs 12866

HASEMEIER, Alfred C., Director, Mid-York Library System, 1602 Lincoln Avenue, Utica 13502

HEFFERNAN, Virginia M., Public Library Children's Consultant, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

HELFAND, Esther, Public Library Young Adult Consultant, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

HENNE, Dr. Frances, Professor, School of Library Service, Columbia University, New York 10027

*HENNESSY, Mildred L., Deputy Director, Queens Borough Public Library, 89-11 Merrick Boulevard, Jamaica 11432

*HEPINSTALL, Dr. James, Superintendent, Albany Public Schools, Academy Park, Albany 12207

HILL, Laurence G., Director, Westchester Library System, 28 South First Avenue, Mount Vernon 10550

HOLMGREN, Edwin, President, ANYLTS, Monroe County Library System, 115 South Street, Rochester 14604

HORNER, Margaret L., Assistant Director, Onondaga Library System, 419 West Onondaga Street, Syracuse 13202

*HORSMAN, Mrs. Joyce, Chairman, Library Development, North Colonie Central Schools, Shaker High School, Latham 12110

HUMPHRY, John A., Assistant Commissioner for Libraries, New York State Library, Albany 12224

HURKETT, Jack W., Director, Nioga Library System, 2510 Seneca Avenue, Niagara Falls 14305

JANSEN, Guenter A., Director, Suffolk Cooperative Library System, P.O. Box 187, Bellport 11713

JOSEY, E. J., Academic and Research Libraries Consultant, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

KANN, Mrs. Elizabeth, Chairman of the Library Department, Pearl River Public Schools, Pearl River 10965

KARPEL, Leon, Director, Mid-Hudson Libraries, 103 Market Street, Poughkeepsie 12601

KING, Mrs. Thelma R., Director, Steele Memorial Library of Chemung County, Lake and Church Streets, Elmira 14901

KIRSCH, Dr. Paul E., Superintendent, Salamanca Public Schools, 50 Iroquois Drive, Salamanca 14779

KRAMER, Florence A., Assistant Director, Syracuse Public Library, 335 Montgomery Street, Syracuse 13202

LESTER, Mary P., Assistant Director, Southern Tier Library System, 215 West Pulteney Street, Corning 14850

LILLEY, Mrs. Dorothy, Supervisor of School Libraries, Patchogue-Medford Public Schools, 241 South Ocean Avenue, Patchogue 11772

LINDAUER, Mrs. Dinah, Coordinator of Services and Programs, Nassau Library System, Lower Concourse, Roosevelt Field Shopping Center, Garden City 11530

LOOBY, Dr. Thomas F., Superintendent, Patchogue Public Schools, 241 South Ocean Avenue, Patchogue 11772

LYONS, Grace, Librarian, Kings Park State Hospital, Kings Park 11754

McNULTY, Mrs. Elsie, Director, Library Materials Center, Curriculum Enrichment Center, 57-59 South Broad Street, Norwich 13815

*MANCH, Dr. Joseph, Superintendent, Buffalo Public Schools, Room 712, City Hall, Buffalo 14202

MILLS, Mrs. Josephine M., School of Library Science, State University College, Geneseo 14454

MONSON, Dr. Harold, Superintendent, Newburgh Public Schools, P.O. Box 711, Newburgh 12550

MORSE, A. Louis, Director of Libraries, East Meadow Public Schools, Meadowbrook Elementary School, Old Westbury Road, East Meadow 11554

MOSES, Stefan B., Public Library Consultant, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

MOTZ, Mrs. Minne R., Assistant Director of School Library Service, New York City Board of Education, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn 11201

*OLSEN, Maurice D., Coordinator of the Special Education Instructional Materials Center, Bureau of Physically Handicapped Children, Room 870-EBA, State Education Department, Albany 12224

OLSON, Barbara V., Chairman of Library Science Department, Queens College, Flushing 11367

*PORTER, Mrs. Jean, Director, Western New York Regional Library and Instructional Resources, BOCES, 657 Park Avenue, Medina 14103

REVERE, Mrs. Linnea, Supervisor of Libraries, Board of Education, Levittown School District #5, Levittown 11756

RICCIO, Mrs. Evelyn, Coordinator, Media and Museum Education Services, Greater Amsterdam School District, Amsterdam 12010

*RICE, Helen F., Coordinator of Libraries and Curriculum, West Irondequoit Central School District, 370 Cooper Road, Rochester 14617

ROBERTS, Ronald L., Director, North Country Library System, 1050 Arsenal Street, Watertown 13601

*ROBINSON, Paul F., State Health Planning Commissioner, Health Planning Division, New York State Health Department, Holland Avenue, Albany 12209

*SASS, Louis D., Dean, Pratt Institute, Graduate Library School, Brooklyn 11205

SATTLEY, Helen, Director of Library Service, New York City Board of Education, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn 11201

*SEVERINGHAUS, Mrs. Ethel L., Associate, Bureau of School Libraries, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

SÉVIGNY, Allen, Public Library Consultant, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

*SHAVER, Gary, Educational Director, Social Services Department, 112 State Street, Albany 12207

SHERIDAN, Robert, Director, Levittown Public Library, 1 Bluegrass Lane, Levittown 11756

*SISTER M. PERPETURA, R.S.M., School Library Consultant, Brooklyn Catholic School System, 345 Adams Street, Brooklyn 11201

SMITH, Dorothy C., Head, General Field Services Section, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

SMITH, Raymond W., Assistant Director, Four County Library System, 117 Court Street, Binghamton 13901

SMITH, Dr. Susan, Professor, School of Library Science, State University of New York at Albany, 1400 Western Avenue, Albany 12203

*STEVENS, Frank A., Chief, Bureau of School Libraries, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

TOMPKINS, Edgar, Director, Upper Hudson Library Federation, 41 Broad Street, Albany 12202

TOY, Nancy, Children's Consultant, Mid-York Library System, 1602 Lincoln Avenue, Utica 13502

TUCKER, Harold W., Director, Queens Borough Public Library, 89-11 Merrick Boulevard, Jamaica 11432

TUTTLE, Mrs. Dorothea, Library Coordinator, Syracuse City Schools, Syracuse 13202

*VEDDER, Marion H., Head, Institution Library Section, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

WALKER, Fawn, Public Library Consultant, Division of Library Development, New York State Education Department, Albany 12224

*WHITE, E. Leonore, Director, Mohawk Valley Library Association, Union Street and Seward Place, Schenectady 12305

WILL, Grinton I., Director, Yonkers Public Library, 70 South Broadway, Yonkers 10701

WINKLER, Loretta, President, Children's and Young Adult Section, New York Library Association, Westchester Library System, 28 South First Avenue, Mount Vernon 10550

*WYNAR, Dr. Bohdan S., Dean, School of Library Science, State University of New York College at Geneseo, Geneseo 14454

EGAN, Mrs. Mary Joan, Coordinator of School Libraries, Burnt Hills-Ballston Lake Central School, 491 Saratoga Road, Scotia Hills 12302

SILBERBERG, Mrs. Sophie C., New York State Citizens Committee for the Public Schools, 2 West 45th Street, Room 1201, New York 10036

DARLING, Dr. Richard L., Director of Instructional Materials, Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland 20850

GREENAWAY, Emerson, Director, Free Library of Philadelphia, Logan Square, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19100

RHODES, Clayton, Administrative Assistant, Enoch Pratt Free Library, 400 Cathedral Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201

WINNICK, Pauline, Public Library Specialist, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Washington, D.C. 20202

*Indicates intention to attend, but unable to come at last minute.

* * * * *

The following resolution was offered to the Conference on School/Public Library Relations Participants by Brother Emmett Corry, O.S.F., Diocese of Brooklyn. No action was taken on this motion since the group was not an officially constituted body, but was convened by the Education Department for discussion and exchange of ideas.

Be it resolved that we, the participants in the Conference on School/Public Library Relations, motivated primarily by concern for the needs of students for library materials and services recommend that:

Commissioner Allen, through the Bureau of School Libraries, direct that a three-part program to 1) plan, 2) promote, and 3) study innovative, exemplary, cooperative projects between school and public libraries be implemented.

The three parts of this project would be:

1. To have joint meetings between school and public library personnel to plan specific innovative cooperative projects
2. To form a committee chaired by a library school teacher who has knowledge of both fields that would select a variety of the projects planned above for State funding
3. To conduct a 2-year research study of these funded projects by a competent research company; such research to be published and distributed by the State Education Commission.